

BW401

C802

1834

Cubitt's Observations on
Dr Warren's Pamphlet.

1834

BW401

C802

1834

Wesley Memorial Library

**Thursfield Smith Collection
of
Wesleyana**



Atlanta, - Georgia

Wes. 1449

OBSERVATIONS

ON

DR. SAMUEL WARREN'S PAMPHLET,

AGAINST THE

WESLEYAN INSTITUTION.

IN A LETTER TO THE REV. JOSEPH TAYLOR,

PRESIDENT OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CONFERENCE.

BY GEORGE CUBITT.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR;

AND SOLD BY J. MASON, 14, CITY-ROAD, AND 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW;
AND BY SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL, STATIONERS' HALL COURT.

MDCCCXXXIV.

Price Sixpence.

BW401
.C802
1834

LONDON:
PRINTED BY JAMES NICHOLS,
46, HOKTON-SQUARE.

Wes. 1449

OBSERVATIONS

ON

DR. SAMUEL WARREN'S PAMPHLET.

SIR,

DR. WARREN has thought proper to publish a pamphlet, professing to be the speech delivered by him at the last Conference on the subject of the Wesleyan Institution, together with such explanations and additions as he judged to be necessary. From the triumphant tone in which he speaks, he might never have contemplated the possibility of a rejoinder. He seems to have thought that those to whom he has chosen to appeal from the decision of his brethren, had that perfect confidence in his wisdom and veracity, that he had only to argue, and conviction would follow; only to censure, and every character which he chose to condemn would be blasted. Had he, indeed, contented himself with arguing, he might have been allowed to have all his own way. The Institution to which he is now opposed, and which, twelve months ago, he professed to support, will require for its demolition guns of larger calibre than any which he can bring to bear upon it. They, indeed, who want arguments against that which they have determined to oppose, may, perhaps, be satisfied (though even of these the more thoughtful scarcely can be satisfied) with those which the pamphlet contains. I doubt not but that many will laud it as a most wonderful production. There are some who cannot distinguish between the meekness of wisdom, and the plausible smoothness of malignity. These will, of course, both esteem the book, and its author very highly for his book's sake. He tells them that their just rights are endangered, and that he will be their champion; and they, groaning under the weight of chains which their own fancy has forged, and hating the merit which they cannot understand, accept his offers, and clamorously exult in his victory, as though he had unhorsed his adversary by the flourishing of his trumpets. To all this triumph the Doctor and his friends might have been left, if he had contented himself with arguing. He who would have approved of the Institution with John Burdsall as its Theological Tutor, and who con-

demns it, heart and voice, with John Hannah in that office, is not to be regarded as a very formidable opponent. But, Sir, Dr. Warren has not contented himself with argument. A great part of his pamphlet consists of attacks upon others; attacks directly impugning their motives, and supported by misrepresentations so gross, that they who are well acquainted with the circumstances to which he refers, are thunderstruck at his conduct. They know his statements to be as FALSE as they are mischievous; but how to account for falsehood, direct and palpable falsehood, in a Christian Minister, they do not know. They are, indeed, aware that, when men are maddened by disappointment, they often seem to lose the recollection of all that is required from them, I will not say by religion, but even by honourable feeling. I pity the Doctor in his excitement; I pity him more for those bitter reflections which his present conduct must, sooner or later, produce. He has gone to his work with an utter recklessness of consequences. To whatever he may expose himself he cares not, so he may but lacerate the feelings and destroy the character of the objects of his implacable resentment. I let the Doctor's arguments alone. He and his friends will, as a matter of course, declare that I do this because they are unanswerable. I have no wish to disturb their triumphs. They will give me little credit for sincerity, when I assure them that I pity them, that I deplore their infatuation, and that few things would give me greater pleasure than to see evidences of their return to a better state of feeling and judgment.

I am perfectly willing to admit that there may be many who regard the proposed Institution with fears which, while I know them to be groundless, I believe to be honest. To all who desire truth rather than victory, and who feel they gain a victory when they discover the truth; who, uninfluenced by personal antipathies, can consider a serious subject dispassionately;—to all such I am quite satisfied with recommending the “PROPOSALS”* published by the Committee appointed by the Conference of 1833.† The task which I have allotted to myself, Sir, is to examine *the statements* made by Dr. Warren. On these, in fact, his *real* objections to the Institution rest. And I address these remarks to you, both because you have been called by your brethren to the honourable and responsible office which you this year occupy in the Wesleyan Connexion, and because you have witnessed all the circumstances to

* Proposals for the Formation of a Literary and Theological Institution: With a Design to promote the Improvement of the Junior Preachers in the Methodist Connexion. London. 1834. Mason.

† See also “General View of the Principles and Objects of the Wesleyan Theological Institution.”

which I shall have to refer. The Doctor professes to have undertaken *his* task "with unaffected reluctance and pain." But that such professions are so common, and often so unmeaning, I should not only echo the words, but strengthen them. I will only say that I have lived long enough to know that, in submission to the sterner demands of duty, "pain" must often be endured, and "reluctance" often overcome.

Dr. Warren seems to have had (I am sure he ought to have had) some misgivings, as to the line of conduct which he contemplated. He is anxious to show that his public appeal is right. After the opinion of the Conference had been so unequivocally expressed, strong reasons were necessary to justify such an appeal as he has chosen to make. Some he professes to give. Whether they are sufficient or insufficient, is a question to be elsewhere decided. I am not going to meddle with them. I may, however, be allowed to say, that *some* respect was due to the (comparatively speaking) immense majority who negatived the Amendment which he proposed. Long and carefully, as you well know, (though the pamphlet would insinuate to the contrary,) was the question discussed; and to the decision to which the Preachers at length came, (and they professed themselves to be quite prepared for one,) it was the Doctor's duty to bow. What Connexion like ours can continue to exist, if the decisions of such a majority, upon such a subject, are not to be considered as binding and final? Sir, I have said, *of such a majority*. Dr. Warren has thought proper to give the names of some of the Preachers by whom his Amendment was supported. With these brethren I have no dispute. I have no wish to subtract from the weight and worth of their names. Nor do I impugn their motives. Dr. Warren, indeed, charges the more active supporters of the Institution with a design to vest dangerous and unconstitutional power in the hands of a few ambitious individuals; and the rest, with tamely submitting to this unchristian domination themselves, and aiding to subject others, however reluctant, to the same yoke. I am not going to recriminate on the Doctor's favourite THIRTY-ONE. He speaks of them, indeed, as though they were the only men of liberal feelings in the whole Conference, and as though, by their aid, he, like another Catiline, was to overturn the grievous tyranny which oppresses the Connexion. *Vel imperatore, vel milite me utimini*, he says, *Neque animus, neque corpus a vobis aberit*. Grecian gifts and stalking horses, it seems, he does not like; but is his own war-cry, with which the Roman historian might have furnished him,—*En illa, illa, quam sæpe optastis, libertas, præterea decus, gloria, in oculis sita sunt*,—much better? They will tell him, Sir, I doubt not, that *such*

aid as he seems inclined to afford, they do not want. Unless I am very much mistaken, they who might agree with him on the simple question of the Institution will entirely disapprove both of his book, and of his conduct in publishing it. That which they did in the Conference they did honestly, and, as they thought, wisely. But is there neither honesty nor wisdom in the majority? The Doctor has mentioned the names of some whom I honour as Fathers, of others whom I love as Brethren. They will receive no pleasure from finding their names thus paraded. When the question was decided against them, they submitted; and some of them, to their honour be it spoken, put down their names as annual subscribers. I will not follow Dr. Warren's example in endeavouring to array brethren against brethren; but I may be allowed to say, that, neither for age, talent, nor character, was the majority one whit behind the minority. To have submitted would not have disgraced the Doctor himself. The matter had been decided against him; and he might have awaited the ulterior decision of time. He has chosen to act otherwise; and more deeply than I can express do I regret his resolution. Evils I see arising from it which he ought to have foreseen; and the foresight of which, I will yet venture to believe, would have prevented an act by which he has committed himself beyond the possibility of retreat. He has acted deliberately, and must abide the consequences.

In the course of his argumentation he employs an expression to which I wish to direct your attention, before I come to those parts of the pamphlet on which I intend principally to remark; an expression by which he endeavours to feed the opposition of the prejudiced and factious. In the conclusion of his speech, he professes to tell you what the real question was which the Conference had to decide. He puts it thus: "Whether, in a word, you will barter the pure and solid gold of the sanctuary for the base alloy and showy tinsel of external decoration." This was not spoken in ignorance. He knew the plan of study to which the students would be required to attend, and had himself agreed to it. That plan allow me to quote from the Minutes of the last Conference:—

"The plan of tuition for resident students shall comprehend as many of the following subjects as, on a careful consideration of the previous attainments and probable opportunities of the several students, may be deemed suitable and practicable: namely, 1. English Grammar, Composition, and Elocution; Geography and History; and elementary instruction in the Mathematics, Natural Philosophy and Chemistry; and in Logic and the Philosophy of Mind. 2. Theology; including the Evidences, Doctrines, Duties, and Institutions of Christianity; and having particular reference to

those views of the Christian system in its application to experimental and practical religion, which are held by our body to be conformable to the holy Scriptures. This will also include the general principles of church order and government, connected with a distinct exposition of our own established discipline, and of the proper methods of administering it for the purity, edification, and preservation of our societies; and a view of the nature and importance of the pastoral office and care, with special reference to the duties and engagements of a Methodist Preacher. 3. The elements of Biblical criticism; the methods of critically studying the Scriptures, the rules and principles to be observed in their application; Hebrew, Greek, and Roman antiquities; and the outlines of Ecclesiastical History. 4. The most useful methods of direct preparation for the Pulpit; and general instructions for the composition and acceptable delivery of sermons. 5. Such instructions in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, as may enable the students to read and study the sacred Scriptures in their original tongues, and prepare them for the successful pursuit of farther classical and biblical knowledge, when they shall be called into Circuits or Missions. This branch of instruction may, however, be wholly omitted, at the discretion of the Officers of the Institution, if, on examining the student, at his first admission, or subsequently, they shall deem it most convenient to confine his attention to the English and Theological Classes."

In reference to the whole plan, the Annual Address to the Societies adopted by the Conference, thus speaks: "Personal piety, and the inward call of the Holy Ghost, are with us, as to the ministerial office, first principles which can never be forgotten without guilt. But these points being permanently secured, it has appeared to us that measures should be adopted so to direct the studies of the junior preachers, that in the least time, and with the least possible hazard to their piety and subsequent usefulness, they may obtain that competent acquaintance with the works, and most especially with the word, of God, which shall, by the divine blessing, render their ministrations both more acceptable and more efficient."

I ask, Sir, what there is in this plan to justify the expressions, "*the base alloy and showy tinsel of external decoration?*" what, to warrant the charge that there was a deficiency of attachment to "*the pure and solid gold of the sanctuary?*" When Dr. Warren, —who, it must be recollected, came into the Methodist Itinerancy as most young men do,—when Dr. Warren, stationed as a Methodist Preacher at Glasgow and Edinburgh, chose to enter himself at their respective universities, and seek the "external decorations" of a Scotch LL.D., I should like to know what there was in *his* studies

that there will not be, according to the proposed plan, in the studies of the young men in the Wesleyan Institution? If they who pursue the plan laid down by the Conference are actually "*bartering the pure gold of the sanctuary for the base alloy and showy tinsel of exterior decorations*," what was the Doctor doing while studying at Glasgow and Edinburgh? Perhaps, indeed, he thinks that for him to have devoted a portion of his time, while stationed on those Circuits as a Methodist Preacher, to the prosecution of collegiate studies, was *one thing*; but that for a number of young men, recommended according to rule by their respective Quarterly and District Meetings, to pursue the proposed plan of study in the Institution-House, under the direction of *Jabez Bunting* and *John Hannah*, living, at the same time, under the spiritual superintendence of *Joseph Entwisle*, their specially appointed Pastor, is *quite another thing*. Sir, *I think so too*. And I think, with many others, that even if the prosecution of such a plan of study were improper for young candidates for the Christian ministry among us, Dr. Warren is not exactly the man to object to it.* If such studies be "*base alloy and showy tinsel*," it is wrong to pursue them at any time. And if it was not wrong for Dr. Warren to seek such advantages of collegiate education as at Glasgow and Edinburgh he could obtain, then the question between himself and the supporters of the Institution becomes a mere question of time. The education itself is a good thing; but for young men, before they commence their labours in a Circuit, to prosecute this course for a couple of years, under the personal care and direction of *Joseph Entwisle*, *Jabez Bunting*, and *John Hannah*, and a large Committee of Management,—this is "*bartering the pure gold of the sanctuary for the base alloy and showy tinsel of external decorations*!"

To the fact, that both to the proposed plan of study, and to the Institution itself, Dr. Warren, as a member of last year's Committee, gave his assent, I shall soon have to direct your attention. It is well known that he quite approved of the "*hot-house Institution*,"—quite approved of placing the young plants in those "*insalubrious fumes*" under whose influence "*they would degenerate and become worthless, if not even noxious*;"—of all this he approved, till, in an unlucky moment, the Committee, *unmoved by his speech on the subject*, fixed upon other gardeners than those whom he had

* The Doctor gives this motto on his title-page:—*Non tali auxilio—tempus eget*. Perhaps not. But, whether it does, or not, "*such defenders*" of "the spiritual interests of our Zion," and of "the simplicity of Christ," are better out of the field than in it. He did not go far enough into the *Æneid* for his motto. A better would have been,—

Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.

recommended. Of this, however, I shall have to say more hereafter. At present I will only say that if all these arguments and figures furnish a fair specimen of collegiate logic and rhetoric, then does the Doctor supply, as many thought at the Conference, "A POWERFUL ARGUMENT AGAINST AN INSTITUTION."

Sir, Dr. Warren knows that it is very easy for him to argue that the proposed Institution is unnecessary. It is very easy for him to turn to Preachers and people, and, in effect, triumphantly to tell them that they are as well as they can be. It is very easy for him to represent the advocates of the Institution as "endeavouring to PANDER to the tastes of fastidious hearers," who, it seems, are often very improperly troublesome to the Stationing Committee. He knew, Sir, very well that his opponents rest a great part of their case on the necessity of supplying existing deficiencies; and that therefore they occupy a position in public discussion, which, except in the last extremity, constrains their silence. That extreme case, however, thanks to the reckless manner in which the opponents of the institution choose to conduct their opposition, and the extent to which they seem resolved to carry it, may yet occur.

And now, Sir, I come to the most painful part of the task which I have assigned myself. It is evident, on the Doctor's own showing, though he has not honest manliness enough directly to avow it, that his real objections to the Institution all spring from personal and angry feeling. In addition to what he gives as his *actual* speech, he presents us with the *suppressed passages*; representing himself as having been put down by "*the MOST INDECENT, UNMANNERLY UPROAR he ever witnessed in a public assembly.*" Had he *chosen* to give an *honest* representation of the facts he refers to, you, Sir, well know that he could have done so. And he, too, well knows that he is not describing what actually occurred. Fair description would not answer his purpose, and therefore he has had recourse to both *defective* and *distorted* statement. The real state of the case it will be my business soon to lay before you. And against you, too, does he bring his charge of corrupt motive and practice. You, Sir, placed by your brethren at their head, did not interfere to prevent the "*most indecent and unmannerly uproar that*" DR. WARREN "*ever witnessed in a public meeting!*" Thus does he choose to charge the Conference; thus does he choose to charge you. Thus does he choose to describe to the world the proceedings of a body of Christian Ministers, assembled to deliberate on the affairs of a large and influential section of the Christian church. "*Most indecent and unmannerly uproar,*" indeed! The Doctor seems to have forgotten, both that Conferences come annually, and that, though he does possess the "external decorations" of an LL.D.,

he is yet amenable to the discipline of the Connexion. Nor is this all. You, the President of the Conference, are not only represented as allowing the Doctor to be put down by "*most indecent and unmannerly uproar*,"—contrary, of course, to your duty,—but likewise as interfering yourself. You, Sir, are engaged in this sad conspiracy "to give a power to a few, which tends to abridge the liberties of the brethren, and endanger the just rights of the people." Yes, Sir, "BY THE CHAIR" was he prevented from saying all that he wanted to say, "UNDER PRETENCE that he was not in order." I am very much mistaken in my Fathers and Brethren, if they will allow the highest officer of their body to be thus *unequivocally, grossly, intentionally, and publicly insulted* by any of their number, even should he be an LL.D., opposing with his whole soul "*the base alloy and showy tinsel of exterior decorations*." More of this, however, by and by. At present, I propose to inquire whether the Doctor has given a fair, honest representation of the facts on which he professes to base his arguments and objections. Even had he done so, I should still have contended that they did not warrant his inferences. But I am not going to demur to his reasonings. *I deny his facts.* I deny that his descriptions bear anything like resemblance to the occurrences to which he applies them. This, Sir, is the real issue to be tried. And it is one, to a just decision upon which, approbation of the Institution is by no means necessary. That must stand or fall according to its merits. It may be a very good or a very bad thing. Its tendencies may be very beneficial; they may be very injurious. All this I lay on one side. I will not mix up the *principle* of the Institution with any personal controversy. I refer to facts, and to facts only. Have we, the question is, in the Doctor's pamphlet, an account, *substantially correct*, of the facts which he professes to describe? I assert that *we have not*. I do not mean to refer to any trifling variations and inaccuracies, not affecting the general character of the narration, and which might easily occur in the most honest description. I refer to such variations, and to such variations only, as make the facts as published entirely different from the facts which actually occurred; *variations evidently intentional*.

Sir, it is well known to you that the Conference of 1833 appointed a Committee for the purpose of arranging a plan for the better education of the candidates for our ministry, composed of the following Preachers: The President and Secretary of the Conference, (Messrs. Treffry and Grindrod,) Messrs. R. Newton, J. Bunting, J. Gaulter, J. Entwisle, R. Reece, J. Taylor, S. WARREN, LL.D., W. Naylor, J. Stanley, T. Lessey, T. Jackson, J. Beecham, J. Hannah, T. Galland, R. Alder, T. Waugh, V. Ward, and

D. Walton. This Committee, according to the direction of the Conference, met in London on the 23d of October, 1833, at the Mission-House, Hatton-Garden, and continued their sittings, by various adjournments, to the 30th of the same month. The result of their deliberations was published in the "Proposals" to which I have already referred. At present I wish to direct your particular attention to the ninth Resolution :—

"That the members of this Committee who reside in London, *with the following gentlemen*, Messrs. Haslope, Farmer, Buttress, Hunter, J. S. Elliott, Hoby, James Wilde, P. Kruse, Jenkins, Pocock, and G. Bowes, be respectfully requested to form a provisional committee, *with power to add to their number*, to make inquiries concerning the best methods of conducting educational establishments, to draw up a system of rules for the regulation of the proposed Institution, to inquire after suitable premises, and to examine minutely the estimates of probable expense and income now produced ;—that the present Committee shall be adjourned till Thursday, the 17th of next July, when they shall assemble in London, at nine o'clock in the morning, to receive the Report of the Provisional Committee, and *finally arrange the plan to be recommended to the Conference* ;—that the President and Secretary of the Conference be respectfully requested to invite such Preachers, and *other influential friends*, from various parts of the kingdom, as they may think proper, to meet this Committee *for the purpose of a friendly conversation*, with a view to explain the nature and advantages of the proposed plan, to receive their opinion and counsel respecting it, and to ascertain, before the meeting of the Conference, in what degree it is likely to obtain the pecuniary support of our societies and congregations ; and that this latter meeting shall take place on Saturday, the 26th of next July, at nine o'clock in the morning."

Sir, of the Resolutions of which the foregoing is one, the "Proposals" say, that they were unanimously adopted. Dr. Warren himself says as much in his pamphlet : "The Secretary having omitted those conclusions from which I dissented, specifying them on a separate paper, *whilst those only in which the Committee were unanimous* were to be published to the Connexion." (P. 25.) I have, therefore, Dr. Warren's authority for saying that he agreed to the resolution I have just now quoted. In pursuance of it, *all* the London Preachers, not being members of the October Committee, together with the gentlemen already mentioned, were invited, in the month of June, to meet such members of that Committee as were resident in London, in order to form themselves, which they agreed to do, *into a Provisional Com-*

mittee for the purposes which the Resolution specifies ; and on the 17th of July this Provisional Committee met the other members of the October Committee for the purpose of reporting their proceedings. Of this meeting the Doctor says, "In the adjourned meeting above referred to, on Thursday, the 17th of July, several *lay* gentlemen had been incorporated with the original Committee, together with an additional number of Preachers." (P. 7.) True : But that incorporation had been in virtue of a resolution of the original Committee, to which Dr. Warren himself had agreed. This insinuation, however, is nothing to the gross and palpable mis-statement contained in the Speech in reference to the meeting held at the chapel in Great Queen Street, on the forenoon of Saturday, the 26th of July. I cannot help again quoting the Resolution in question, to which, Dr. Warren being witness, the October Committee had unanimously agreed : "That the President and Secretary of the Conference be respectfully requested *to invite such Preachers and other influential friends from various parts of the kingdom as they may think proper, to meet this Committee for the purpose of a friendly conversation,*" &c. You will observe, Sir, by the way, that at this meeting the principle and arrangements were not to be made the subjects of *discussion*, but simply of "*friendly conversation.*" The meeting of the 17th of July was for the purpose, as the Resolution states, of a FINAL arrangement of the plan to be submitted to the Conference. The meeting of the 26th of July was, in point of fact, what the Resolution intended and described. Knowing these circumstances, as I did, judge, Sir, of my surprise when I read Dr. Warren's account of that meeting. He calls it "a meeting *got up* in London for the same purpose ;" that is, as I suppose, "to elicit an opinion favourable to the projected Institution." (Page 19.) He adds : "*A very numerous issue of CARDS OF INVITATION* had been made to lay gentlemen both in town and country." Sir, is this honest ? Dr. Warren, with the other members of the Committee, had agreed that such a meeting should be called by the President and Secretary of the Conference, and now he chooses to represent the Circular Letters, issued for that purpose, as "*cards of invitation*" to a "*got-up*" meeting. He says that only those were invited who were *friendly* to the Institution. Very true. The meeting was not for discussion, but for "*friendly conversation.*" The Committee were to meet on the 17th of July for the *final arrangement* of the plan, and ten days afterwards a large meeting was to be called to have this plan detailed, to hold a *friendly* conversation upon upon it, to suggest various counsels, and to make inquiries on the point of pecuniary support. Sir, the

October Committee very properly wished to be able to lay before Conference not a mere plan, but a plan in connexion with the necessary statements respecting the practicability of it : A *concrete*, rather than an *abstract*, plan. In pursuance of this design was the Resolution I have quoted agreed to ; and in pursuance of the same object the meeting of the 26th of July was summoned and held. The Doctor argues, indeed, that from such a meeting, no fair inference could be drawn as to the opinion of our societies and congregations at large ; and no one for a moment doubts but that his arguing is *correct*. It is, however, utterly *needless*. The Great Queen Street meeting had a definite intention and character, corresponding to the Resolution which led to it. I never heard any argument from the opinions of that meeting, delightful a one as it was, to the general opinions of our people. Dr. Warren *reasons* rightly ; but he reasons without an adversary. That to which I object is the practical falsehood of the statement which he gives. The phrase, *a got-up meeting*, is both significant and definite ; and, in the usual sense of the words, the meeting was *not* a “got-up” one. As to its *impropriety*, I have nothing to do with that. “Not to dwell on the *impropriety of such a meeting*, anticipating the judgment of the Conference,” &c. (Page 19.) The meeting was called, not by any particular friends of the Institution, wishing to bolster up their cause by artifice ; for to this does Dr. Warren’s account of it come : He represents it as *a got-up* meeting ; he says that no *impartial* opinion could be formed from it ; and that it was one “of the most compendious and effectual methods of obtaining a majority that can be imagined ;” language which is utterly unmeaning if it does not charge some supporters of the Institution with a design both to *overawe* the Conference and *impose* upon it. The meeting was regularly called by the President and Secretary of the Conference according to the unanimous Resolution of the October meeting ; Dr. Warren, therefore, being a consenting party. Whether the meeting was proper or improper, (and, as I think, it was a very proper one, and the October Committee acted wisely in requesting such a one to be called,) still, the Doctor is not the man to object to it. But my charge against him is not of inconsistency in objecting to it, but of such an *intentional inaccuracy* in description as must give to every reader of his pamphlet an impression, in point of fact, *false*. And thus, Sir, as he charges you with gross failure in your duty as President, so does he charge your truly respectable predecessor. Mr. Treffry, by affixing his signature to the “*cards of invitation*,” was a party to this *got-up* meeting, designed, according to the obvious meaning of the Doctor’s paragraph, to impose upon the Conference, and

overawe its deliberations. The Doctor cuts right and left with great earnestness. It is well that his arm has no power, his weapon no edge.

From the meeting held on the 26th of July at Great Queen Street, allow me now to go back to the one at the Mission-House on the 17th of July. This was held, according to the Resolution already quoted, to receive the Report of the Provisional Committee. This Committee, I should say, met first on the 24th of June, at which, and at subsequent meetings, the plan of the October Committee, and the other subjects for which they had been called together, were very seriously considered, and various *modifications* proposed and agreed to. These, of course, had to be proposed to the October Committee at the meeting of the 17th of July. At this meeting certain circumstances occurred to which I must now refer you. One of them, Dr. Warren, the great advocate of Christian simplicity, so earnestly and faithfully warning his brethren against an Institution which he thinks will greatly endanger it, thus describes : "It was at this meeting that certain modifications of the plan, as left at the October Committee, were proposed for consideration. I stated at once that, in consequence of what had occurred at the October Committee, and the subsequent correspondence, I was constrained to dissent in principle from the entire project." (Page 7.) Who, Sir, reading this, would not suppose that the modifications referred to were proposed to the meeting; and then that the Doctor rose and *promptly* and *openly* declared his dissent? "Certain modifications were proposed; I AT ONCE stated my dissent." Sir, have these words any meaning? They have, and *that meaning they were intended to convey*. The Doctor meant his readers to understand that, upon the modifications being proposed, he, without evasion or constraint, *freely* and *fully* stated his dissent. "I AT ONCE STATED," are his own words. But do these words, in their plain and obvious meaning, fairly describe what took place? I appeal to you, Sir; I appeal to those honourable gentlemen, whose names have been already mentioned as members of the Provisional Committee; I appeal, in a word, to every person present; and, thus appealing to those on whom Dr. Warren may call to contradict me, if I say what is in the least degree incorrect, (*I wish he would call on them,*) I say, Sir, that he did not thus state his dissent *at once*. The real state of the case is this: So soon as the meeting was ready to proceed to business, Mr. Bunting asked whether Dr. Warren were still friendly to the principle of the Institution, or whether, since the October meetings, he had changed his opinion. Above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question. He did not, be it

observed, say that he would not reply. The case then would have been different. I am not called to say whether such refusal would have been right or wrong. I say that every method of evasion was resorted to by him. Every shift was practised to avoid a direct answer. The point was pressed, urged, by various members of the Committee. Never, even in a reluctant witness in a court of justice, under a severe cross-examination, did I see such an hour of shuffling as in that hour which Dr. Warren would contract to a moment of unconstrained, unsolicited promptitude, by his significant "AT ONCE." Sir, I am persuaded that any English Judge, after such conduct in a witness, would order him out of the box, and *at once* strike out his testimony. It was not till after an hour spent as I have described, that the Doctor said that, after the *disingenuous and interested conduct* which he had witnessed in October and since, he had changed his mind. He does not, indeed, quote his own language. His attacks upon others he conceals, that thus he may represent their conduct in the most unfavourable light possible. Was it nothing, to tell a number of Christian Ministers that, in the execution of a sacred trust confided to them, their conduct had been, not mistaken,—mistake is consistent with honesty and fidelity,—but *disingenuous*, that is, contrary to Christian simplicity; and *interested*, that is, contrary to Christian honesty. These charges the Doctor adroitly conceals. It is, "*I stated at once*" my dissent. Sir, in contradiction, direct and intentional, I, as an eye and ear witness, deny that he *at once* stated this. Let the Doctor, while the matter is fresh on the minds of the persons present, especially the *lay* members of the Provisional Committee, take steps to disprove my contradiction. If he does not, a line of conduct is charged on him which leaves all his statements unworthy of credit.

In the course of the conversation to which I have referred, the words "unprincipled opposition" were used. Dr. Warren lays great stress upon them in several parts of his pamphlet. He tells us that his friends advised him to bring the matter before the Conference. That is, I suppose, his friends *out of the meeting*, to whom he would give his own version of the story. They must have been at a loss to conceive why their advice was not followed. I exceedingly regret this myself. The occurrence was recent; the recollection of it fresh in the minds of those who were present; the witnesses were all at hand; they could have been examined by Dr. Warren himself; and upon the case, thus legitimately before the Conference, he could have said what he rather wished to say when a question altogether distinct was under discussion. He must not claim any credit for forbearance with those who know the truth of

the case. He knew better than to do as his friends advised him. He knew that he could better accomplish his object by an *ex parte* statement addressed to the public. The words were undoubtedly used. No one is going to deny it. But in what sense were they used? In connexion with what circumstances did they occur? Was there, at the time, any explanation given by the speaker of the sense in which he used them? These are not only important but necessary questions, to which, however, the pamphlet affords no reply. The Doctor quotes the expression as though it were exactly synonymous with "unprincipled opponent." Thus does he evidently intend that his readers should understand it.

This part of the case it will be necessary to examine at some length. Indeed, this is the greatest difficulty of my task. A brief sentence may contain a misrepresentation which shall, in fact, "out-face all truth;" whereas the necessary explanations may require details extending through long paragraphs. These detailed explanations must, however, be given. And here, lest I should be charged with "*artifice*," "*dishonourable intrigue*," and "*disingenuous and interested conduct*," let me state, most explicitly, that I was not "eye and ear witness" of the discussions of the October Committee. What actually occurred I could only learn from those who were present. This, however, is not important, inasmuch as all that is needful to a right understanding of the case which has been related to me by others, has either been, in my own presence, confirmed by the Doctor himself, or is so by the pamphlet now before me.

The October Committee met at the appointed time, and after, I doubt not, very serious and deliberate discussions, agreed upon certain Resolutions which were subsequently published in the "Proposals." In these Resolutions, in which the pamphlet itself allows that the Committee were unanimous, both the principle of an Institution and the general plan of management and tuition are distinctly recommended. To these Dr. Warren agreed. He distinctly acknowledged this in the meeting of the 17th of July. Other proceedings, he tells us, took place, by which his suspicions were awakened, and from which he expressly dissented. But, from the prior Resolutions he dissented not, even to the last, and the Committee broke up with the conviction that up to a certain point, their conclusions were unanimous. The proceedings from which the Doctor dissented, and which led him "*ultimately* to differ from the opinions of the majority," related to the Officers of the Institution. The names which the Committee agreed, with the exception of Dr. Warren, to recommend to Conference were those of Mr. Bunting, Mr. Hannah, Mr. Galland, and Mr. Walton. As it is upon this recommendation that his objections to the Institution itself are professedly

founded, it will be necessary to examine it carefully both in itself, and in reference to the brethren included in it. Before I do this, I will recite once more the names of the agreeing members of the Committee, praying that particular attention may be paid to them. Dr. Warren's charges against them are of the heaviest character: I wish it to be kept in mind against whom these charges are directed. —Richard Treffry, Edmund Grindrod, Robert Newton, Jabez Bunting, John Gaulter, Joseph Entwisle, Richard Reece, Joseph Taylor, William Naylor, Jacob Stanley, Theophilus Lessey, Thomas Jackson, John Beecham, John Hannah, Thomas Galland, Robert Alder, Thomas Waugh, Valentine Ward, and Daniel Walton.

These, Sir, are the brethren among whom Dr. Warren stands as the sole objector. He alone has the shrewdness to discover, or the virtue to oppose, the designs of the dominant party among them. These are the brethren, some of whom are charged with the most glaring imbecility in consenting to plans so perilous, others with not less glaring wickedness in forming and proposing them, and then continuing to support them by party spirit, by artifice, by dishonourable intrigue. Whether these charges are well founded, or not, it is now my business to inquire.

The Committee assembled in London, according to the appointment of the Conference, and proceeded to the task assigned them, of arranging a plan for the better education of the Junior Preachers. After due deliberation, they agreed, UNANIMOUSLY, to recommend, in preference to any other method, the establishment of an Institution. Now, if their whole duty had been to fix upon some general plan, here their proceedings should have terminated; and they should have left it to the ensuing Conference, should the plan recommended be approved, to appoint a second Committee for the purpose of recommending to the Conference of 1835 the particular plans of study, the locality of the Institution, and its Officers. The October Committee well knew that a more extensive Report would be expected; and, therefore, having fixed upon the principle, they proceeded to consider the details. For such an Institution these details would necessarily comprise three classes,—the methods of study, the locality of the Institution, and its Officers. All these were necessary for a complete Report. The recommendations (a far more correct term than *nomination*, employed by the Doctor) were not, of course, final, but subject, as well as the principle itself, to the decision of the Conference. It was in the power of the brethren assembled in Conference to reject the recommended principle, and adopt another; to reject the recommendations comprised in the various details, and to fix upon other and very different ones. And there-

fore did Mr. Burdsall, in his address, propose, not that the Preachers should pass to what Dr. Warren chooses to call *the order of the day*, but that a different plan of instruction should be adopted. He fully admitted, as you will recollect, *the absolute necessity of doing something, and something effectual*, even while he seemed to support the Doctor's proposition for *doing nothing*. Neither in proposing principle nor details was there, in the least degree, interference with the authority of the Conference. I lay stress on these seemingly trivial circumstances because Dr. Warren mentions it as suspicious that the Committee proceeded to the consideration of the question of Officers. Sir, to do this was as much their duty as it was to consider the particular plan of study, and the locality of the Institution. The principle being laid down, three questions arose for consideration. The young men are to be instructed in an Institution. This furnishes the groundwork. *WHAT* shall they be taught? *WHERE* shall they be taught? *BY WHOM* shall they be taught? These are the naturally-arising questions to which it was necessary that the Report should contain a reply. And I, Sir, in my turn, note it as a most suspicious circumstance, that Dr. Warren goes heartily into the two former, and commences the last, without giving any intimation that the Committee were exceeding their legitimate powers. Had he chosen, I doubt not but that he could have shown that it was a very suspicious circumstance that the Committee, anticipating the decision, and usurping the prerogative of the Conference, should have presumed, not only to fix on the exact method and subjects of instruction, but even the locality of the projected Institution. And yet *thus far*, and even *farther*, the Doctor went without alarm. I, for my own part, can easily conceive of very *grave and weighty objections* against the recommended locality, urged with very great earnestness, by various Preachers and friends in the country; objections, at least as grave and weighty as those urged by the Doctor against the recommendation of Officers. "We object," might these brethren say, "to the recommendation *in limine*. The Committee had no right to exceed their powers. They were appointed to arrange a plan for the better education of the Junior Preachers, not to inquire where that plan, if agreed upon, should be carried into effect. Besides, it is a most suspicious circumstance that they have recommended London. All power will thus be concentrated in the metropolis, and the just rights of the people, and the liberties of the brethren, be endangered by the perilous plan. In London there is the Missionary Committee, comprising the Foreign Department; there is the Book Committee, having a mighty influence upon the press; and now the concerns of the Home Department are to be managed in the same place. What!

Is there such a dearth of places in the Connexion, that all power must thus reside in London? London stands *first* on the list of stations; and every one knows, from the despotism of papal Rome, that *primacy* may become *supremacy*. And then, as by and by the London University *may* have the power of conferring degrees, and the young men *may* fall in love with Gower-Street honours, we shall have a Pope and his Cardinals, and a whole host of illegitimate Bishops; we shall have *cassocked Priests* with their black gowns, and *Doctors of Laws* with their red ones;* and then, where will be the original simplicity of Methodism? Besides," proceed the objectors, looking still more seriously, "the Committee have named a Provisional Committee, concerning which the Minute is silent; and on that Committee we find the names of certain lay gentlemen, all resident in London or its neighbourhood, and therefore interested in adding to an influence in which they may hope to share. And these gentlemen join in recommending London. Yes, indeed! They well know that the premises will want repairing, that the young men will want *coals, clothes, and furniture*; and sometimes a little *physic*. Had the projectors of the Institution fixed on Shetland or Scilly we might have supported it; but when they depart from the legitimate subject of discussion, and proceed of their own authority to nominate the locality of the Institution, we are constrained to dissent in principle from the entire project." Thus might objectors argue; but Dr. Warren could not join them, for he himself had gone with the Committee into the examination of *two* of the *three* necessary subjects of detailed inquiry; and having agreed to the principle of such extended inquiry, it is not competent to him to object to its complete prosecution. There was nothing in the nomination of Officers more suspicious than in the recommendation of the locality. Each proceeded from the intention of the Committee to present to the Conference as complete a Report as possible.

The Committee, then, in proceeding to the question of Officers, were only executing with fidelity the trust reposed in them. Thus far the way is clear. The next point in the inquiry is, On whom did their choice fall? Most readily is it acknowledged that

* Dr. Warren may think that the red gown of a Scotch University Student is more becoming than the black gown of Oxford and Cambridge. There is certainly no disputing about taste. Some years ago I heard a very strong objection urged in a Glasgow Quarterly Meeting against a Methodist Preacher running up and down the streets with his red gown flying behind him like the tail of a monkey. The Rev. Messrs. Burdall and Beaumont were present with me at the time, and will recollect the occasion on which, and the person in reference to whom, the words were used. I only say that they were *not* used in reference to any Preacher then in the Circuit, none of whom had any intention of wearing the exterior decoration of a red gown.

while the Committee acted right in proceeding to the selection of persons to be recommended to Conference, they *might* be influenced by improper motives in the selection itself. Their right to select I have already vindicated; into the character of the selection I have now to inquire. And thus, Sir, I come to the very *gist* of Dr. Warren's charge against them. He prefers an indictment against his brethren, and adduces evidence in support of it. Both the one and the other I now proceed to examine.

I have to examine, in the first place, the nature and extent of the charges preferred by the Doctor. And it is the more necessary that I do this, because in one part of his speech he professes only to refer to the *tendency of the measure*, and not to the *motives* by which its supporters were influenced. He says, "The weightiest reason of all the rest, because all the rest appear to me to be contained in it, and naturally to flow from it, is this: That the Institution now proposed has an obvious tendency to increase such power in the hands of a few individuals, as is likely to be detrimental to the liberty of the Preachers, and perilous to the unity of the body itself." That is, if I understand the Doctor's "*contained in it*," and "*naturally to flow from it*," the principle of instruction by an Institution is inadmissible, because the Officers, being naturally selected from among the most talented of the Preachers, *may* possibly become tyrants, and use their influence to bad purposes. Thus thought the Athenians, when they passed their famous law of banishment by Ostracism. A man of talent and virtue,—an Aristides,—may acquire too much influence;—banish him for ten years, and leave the concerns of the republic in the hands of men of little talent and less virtue. Often and bitterly had she to regret that she had driven her wisest statesmen from her councils, her bravest warriors from her armies. And thus does Dr. Warren reason. He argues, "We must do nothing that *may* possibly prove perilous." But, to put talented and virtuous men into office *may* put our liberties in peril: Therefore, talented and virtuous men must be kept out of office. And thus, as men *without* talent and virtue are not fit for office, and office is not fit for men *with* talent and virtue, we had better have no Officers, no offices, at all! To this does the Doctor's arguing bring us. "All the rest appear to be contained in it, and to flow naturally from it." This, however, is only in passing. He proceeds thus: "Far be it from me to insinuate that any preconcerted scheme of infringing the liberty of their brethren, or the rights of the people, is in the contemplation of any of the HONOURABLE members of the Committee." Let it be observed, Sir, that up to the time of his thus addressing the Conference, Dr. Warren, *according to his own profession*, has no suspicion of ANY of the

members of the Committee. They are all HONOURABLE members. He may doubt the wisdom of their plans, but he will not even insinuate that their "INTENTIONS" are "SINISTER." Thus does he seek, Sir, by meek and plausible professions of great candour, to impose on the unwary. Had the other parts of his pamphlet been in the same spirit as would seem to be implied in these words, the task of replying to them would not have been what now it is. But I look at the pamphlet as a whole, and I find one spirit breathing through the whole of it. Such unequivocal attacks on the motives of his opponents do I find in other places, that I cannot avoid the conclusion, that these expressions, seemingly so candid, are *utterly insincere*, and that he *did* mean to insinuate that such a scheme for infringing the rights of the people, and the liberties of the Preachers, was actually in the contemplation of these *honourable* members of the Committee.

I will quote some of the Doctor's charges against the Committee, and those associated with them in the same cause. The amount of the charges I will next endeavour to determine.

"The *gross partiality* shown to the opposite side, *in urging forward, at all hazards, a favourite scheme of certain individuals.*" (Page 3.)

"I was *obstreperously clamoured down* by the opposite party." (Page 4.)

"The offices of Theological and Classical Tutors remained to be filled; and anxious to try, at least, *the fairness of the motives* which dictated such an anomalous and *unwarrantable* proceeding," (that is, the nomination of Officers,) "I rose and named two individuals of unexceptionable character and qualifications who were NOT" (so the pamphlet gives the word) "members of the Committee." (Page 5.)

"This proposal, however, was at once rejected, and two others who WERE" (so in the pamphlet) "members of the Committee were nominated in their stead. This proceeding, together with the astounding proposal that Mr. Bunting should not only be the President of the Institution, but also a Theological Tutor, and moreover, still retain the laborious, responsible, and influential office of Senior Secretary of our Foreign Missions, developed the sinister intentions of the parties." (Page 6.)

The Doctor, it will be seen, does not say that these proceedings *disclosed* to his own sagacity what was not perceived by others, *the dangerous tendency of the measure*; but that they "*developed*," that is, unfolded, discovered, made plain, that which previously existed, the "*sinister*," that is, the "*bad, corrupt, perverse, deviating from honesty, unfair*," "intentions of the parties."

"*Developed the sinister intentions of the parties,*" is his unequal vocal expression.

"Little thinking of the *coup de main* that was to be presently attempted. To my amazement it was sought,—*I need hardly add, on grounds the most puerile and frivolous,*—in the first instance, utterly to exclude me from taking any part whatever in the debate ! And it was not till after a conflict of nearly an hour that I succeeded in vindicating my right to be heard. Did this savour of the spirit of *candid inquiry* ? This *device* having failed to take effect," &c. (Page 8.)

To the circumstances here referred to I shall have again to come : I at present only quote the passage as containing a charge on the motives of the Doctor's *honourable* opponents. Here was a *device*, on grounds the most *puerile* and *frivolous*, to prevent him, as by a *coup de main*, from taking any part in the debate. Very *honourable* conduct this !

"That since I had been *refused* the justice of vindicating myself and my cause against calumny before that assembly," &c. (Page 9.)

"The detection, I say, of certain principles," (that is, "in some of the deliberations of the October Committee,") "in operation perilous to the Christian liberty of the great body of the Preachers, and also of the people with whom we are united. This it was which first excited my alarm ; and every succeeding stage of the business has increased and confirmed my suspicion ; especially the shifting, and even contradictory, *policy* pursued to induce me to change my purpose. Such was the ingenious courtesy with which I was solicited, again and again, to accompany certain friends of the Institution on a mission which, had I consented to go, would have implicated me as having yielded the principle of my opposition. And, when *this scheme* did not succeed, the *insulting* manner in which my opposition was *furiously denounced.*" (Page 11.)

"Or whether the *crooked policy* had recourse to by the opposite side in urging forward, at all risks, a *favourite scheme*, is not rather entitled to the unseemly epithet 'unprincipled ;' and I, too, speak 'advisedly,' as will more clearly appear," &c. (Page 12.)

"A meeting *got up* in London."—"A very numerous issue of cards of invitation."—"One of the most compendious and effectual *methods of obtaining a majority* that can be imagined." (Page 19.)

"Not one was *allowed* to be put in nomination with themselves. Nay, an intimation was given, (UNWITTINGLY,) by a venerable member of the Committee, that the subject had already been carefully examined previous to the meeting." (Page 22.)

"Does not every one see that we have only to suppose the President of the Institution to be possessed of *Episcopal* propensities,"

(the italics are the Doctor's, as are those which next follow,) "and it follows as a matter of course, that the Institution will soon become neither more nor less, neither better nor worse, if, indeed, worse can come of it, than a *dominant Episcopal faction*? From hence the Connexion must prepare itself to receive a Liturgical service, a splendid ritual, an illegitimate Episcopal ordination, a cassocked race of Ecclesiastics, and whatever else may render this new, this improved edition of Methodism imposing and magnificent in the eyes of the world." * (Page 23.)

"Not till the circumstances just alluded to, of proposing to surrender almost the whole power over the Institution into the hands of one individual; together with a similar power over our Foreign Missions; that is to say, *almost the sole Dictatorship both of the Home and the Foreign Department*;" † (these italics, too, are the Doctor's;) "not till this posture of our affairs was too obvious to be misinterpreted, did I express my opposition." (Page 25.)

"Was it not in foresight of *such perils as THESE which now threaten us*, that our venerable father and Founder so earnestly cautioned some of the Preachers of his day against *assuming a superiority over the rest*, and employing their influence with partiality?"

And then follows Mr. Wesley's letter to "the Conference of 1785," in which this passage occurs: "I beseech you, to have no respect of persons in stationing the Preachers, in choosing children for Kingswood School, in disposing of the yearly Collection, and the Preachers' Fund, or any other public money." (Pages 23, 24.) Now, putting together the expressions, "*such perils as those which now threaten us*," and, "*almost the sole Dictatorship both of the Home and Foreign Department*," and then connecting them with the paragraph just quoted from Mr. Wesley's letter, (applied as cruelly as it is falsely,) the intention of the Doctor is plainly visible. He thus more than insinuates, and would lead our societies and the world to believe, that the Preachers are threatened with "*these perils*;" namely, that there is a party which is seeking

* New edition of Methodism! Is a Liturgical service a *new* thing among the followers of the venerable Wesley? Had Dr. Warren any respect in his heart for the great Founder of the Methodist societies when he spake thus contemptuously of "cassocked Ecclesiastics?" What were John Wesley, Charles Wesley, John Fletcher, and Thomas Coke, but "cassocked Ecclesiastics?" And what was the Episcopacy established for the Methodist Societies in America by Mr. Wesley himself, but what is thus styled "illegitimate?"

† Did Dr. Warren want a *vacancy* to occur at the Mission House? A Secretaryship might, perhaps, have gratified his ambition, even at his time of life. (Pamphlet, page 6.) He would not have objected to the DICTATORSHIP, provided he might himself have been "MASTER OF THE HORSE."

to obtain a power by which they may regulate the Stations, and the disposal of public money, in the spirit of the Dictatorship; that is, according to their own will and pleasure.

"I nominated two persons, *not*" (so the Doctor) "on the Committee, to fill the vacant offices, not merely as being eminently fitted for the situations, but also" (N. B.) "as a test of the FAIRNESS AND HONESTY of the Committee, and they were rejected, and those only who *were* members of the Committee were *allowed* to be put in nomination." (Page 25.)

"Obviously, nothing is more incongruous than attempting to qualify agents for this sacred work by measures which *require* to be carried through by ARTIFICE and CLAMOUR, rather than Christian simplicity and calm deliberation; nothing so likely to deteriorate and ruin rather than to improve the character of candidates for the sacred office as *expedients* which savour more of PARTY SPIRIT, WORLDLY POLICY, and DISHONOURABLE INTRIGUE, than of the meekness and gentleness of Christ." (Page 34.)

I have quoted thus fully from the Doctor's pamphlet for the purpose of putting his meaning without dispute, and showing that he was using what, viewing it in the most favourable aspect, must be regarded as an unmeaning figure of speech, when he said, "Far be it from me to insinuate that any preconcerted scheme of infringing the liberty of their brethren, or the rights of the people, is in the contemplation of any of the honourable members of the Committee." Thus far, indeed, he says truly, that he does not *insinuate* these things. "*Sinister intentions*" is an expression going far beyond *insinuation*. It is what most people will be disposed to call *direct assertion*. Nor is this an unimportant view of the case. It seems to be the policy of the Doctor's party to represent him as a much injured man, possessing and manifesting great meekness and forbearance, whose motives and character have been so violently and wickedly attacked, that he is constrained, "with unaffected reluctance and even pain," to stand on the defensive. It has therefore been necessary for me to show that his pamphlet is thoroughly a hostile attack on his opponents; and that the two or three instances of attack upon himself, about which he makes so much noise, are, *as instances of attack*, as "puerile and frivolous" in their nature as they are few in their number; that, indeed, they are only adduced to give some show of justice to his own proceedings. It is his plan (I should be justified in using his own word, and saying, It is his *artifice*) to conceal from his readers what is the real fact, that he considered himself at the Conference, (and still evidently considers himself,) as a sort of Leader of Opposition. I sincerely hope, Sir, that this first attempt to introduce political modes of discussion among us

will meet with the fate which it deserves. Nothing more perilous, more ruinous, either to the peace or purity of the Connexion than such a method of proceeding, has been brought forward, even in this budget of accusations. The brethren will now, I trust, see what really are the perils by which we are threatened, and will tell Dr. Warren that the Wesleyan Conference is not to be made the theatre of debates merely for opposition's sake, of contentions for victory. Such conduct is bad enough in private company. It is always inconsistent, not merely with the ministerial, but with the Christian, character. In public it should not be tolerated for a moment. If our Conference discussions are in future to be conducted on this principle, it will be necessary to procure an Act of Parliament for such an enlargement of the Deed of Declaration as shall allow them to sit for twelve calendar months every year, instead of three weeks.

From the passages which I have quoted from the pamphlet, the Doctor's intention and meaning will be obviously apparent. If the language which he has deliberately chosen to employ be indicative of meekness and charity, if it be not indicative of hostility at once bitter, vindictive, and reckless, then have words ceased to be the significant expressions of thought and feeling. Upon his meaning, in point of fact, there is no doubt. I have conversed with many who have read the pamphlet, and I find none who profess to entertain any. And, if they have been friendly to the Doctor, or have thought him what he wishes himself to be thought, an ill-used, persecuted man, they have avowed their opinion without hesitation. All who read the book see very clearly what it aims at. Whether its attacks are believed or disbelieved, approved or disapproved, their object is well understood. Taken by themselves, Dr. Warren's expressions are plain enough. But I shall not consider them as thus standing alone. If the Doctor will identify himself with a party, then have we a right to bring in their comments for the illustrations of his text. Foolish as are his references to Liturgical services, splendid rituals, illegitimate episcopal ordinations, dominant episcopal factions, cassocked Ecclesiastics, showy chapels, and pealing organs, they are not to be misunderstood. They speak the language of a clamorous faction which seeks to alter the whole constitution of Methodism, and which is continually pouring forth the most malignant attacks on one honoured individual, to seek the expulsion of whom from office and influence it labours to excite all who possess the principles and feelings of an Athenian mob; an individual, whose character among other denominations as well as in his own, and before the world, these foul and slanderous libellers are continually labouring to destroy. With this faction the pamphlet before

me proves that its author has unhappily chosen to identify himself. The enemies of Methodism exult in this ; but the best friends of the Doctor, many of whom, by this painful hallucination, he has wrought himself up to consider as his enemies, are sad at heart. As an illustration of the *animus* of the party, and, therefore, of the real character of the charges preferred by the Doctor, allow me to quote a couple of passages from a communication which appeared in "The Times" of Friday morning, October 17, 1834, headed, "Wesleyan Methodism in Manchester," and dated, October 14. The first passage I quote, as showing that Dr. Warren is in communication with others on these subjects ; the second, as showing the character and feelings of the party whose assistance the Doctor thus chooses to seek, and whose objects he is thus willing to promote.

"The publication of this pamphlet, which displays to much advantage the acumen and sagacity of the Doctor, is an offence of the highest magnitude in the eyes of the Methodist 'powers that be ;' and for his temerity in sending it forth, he is to be brought, not to open, but to close, ecclesiastical trial. Yesterday he received from the Rev. Mr. Newton, as Secretary to the Conference, a letter enclosing a list of charges to be preferred against him at a special District Meeting, to be held in Oldham Street chapel in this town to-morrow (Wednesday) week. The charges which are to be prosecuted by the Rev. John Anderson, set forth that the publication of the pamphlet is a breach of the laws of Methodism ; that it contains sundry misrepresentations and unfounded statements ; and that its publication is unbecoming the ministerial character, &c. The announcement of the intention to bring Dr. Warren to trial has already excited very strong feeling in this town and its vicinity ; and thousands of Methodist laymen, feeling that his cause is holy and patriotic, are determined to stand or fall with him."

"This town is again to become a scene for the exercise of dominant church principles by the Tory clique of Preachers in the Wesleyan-Methodist Connexion, and Dr. Warren is to be the victim. A pamphlet has been published by the Doctor within the last few days, in which he ably and satisfactorily explains the reasons of his opposition to the new Theological College, recently formed under the auspices and principal management of the Rev. Jabez Bunting, now a D.D. on the American scale, and of a few other of the Church-loving Methodist Preachers. At the last Conference Dr. Warren was publicly accused by the Rev. Robert Newton of a desire to become a Tutor in the College, intimating, in the same breath, that if such an office had been assigned him, the Conference would never have heard of any opposition from that quarter. He was, nearly at the

same time, charged by Dr. Bunting with 'unprincipled' conduct, the Rev. gentleman stating that he used the word 'advisedly.' From these imputations Dr. Warren was resolved to clear himself, and accordingly resolved to obtain a hearing in full Conference, in the face of his accusers. Much opposition was directed against him, and, notwithstanding noise and clamour, and other unseemly annoyances to boot, he succeeded in delivering a triumphant speech, in which he freed himself from the aspersions cast on his character," &c.

The total disregard to truth manifested by the writer of this paragraph requires no comment. Such, Sir, are the arts by which Dr. Warren allows his cause to be bolstered up; by which it is endeavoured to stimulate the "thousands of Methodist laymen" to make common cause with him.

With all this evidence before us, Sir, it is plain that the Doctor means to charge the October Committee and their associates,—

1. With aiming to establish a dominant, tyrannical, dictatorial power in the Connexion, perilous to the liberty of the brethren, the rights of the people, and the unity of the body.

2. With availing themselves of the opportunity of promoting this their favourite scheme afforded them by the projected establishment of an Institution for the better education of the junior Preachers.

3. With seeking to accomplish their purposes by means which *developed their sinister intentions*; means, which in the whole affair of the Institution, have been characterized by artifice, unfairness, and gross partiality; by party-spirit, and clamour; by dishonesty, and false pretences; by worldly policy, and dishonourable intrigue.

Such, Sir, are the charges which Dr. Warren deliberately and publicly, in a pamphlet sent forth to the world, brings against the brethren whose names I have mentioned, and against the more active of the promoters of the Institution who might subsequently be associated with them. His accusations are put by himself on record; nor can any one who reads the language he employs doubt his meaning. I have put no far-fetched construction on the terms he employs. I have taken them in their ordinary signification, and as explained by comparison with each other, and confirmed by repetition. Words have no meaning, if those used in the Doctor's pamphlet do not express that which I have ascribed to them. And these conclusions are justified by the fact, that the party with which the Doctor has unhappily chosen to connect himself, and which seeks to hinder the necessary exercise of discipline by clamour and intimidation, does, in reality, echo his charges in the sense in which I understand them. The men are attacked rather than the measures; and the measures

chiefly on account of the men. Dr. Warren directly asserts that he was first led to entertain doubts as to the wisdom, propriety, and safety of the proposed plan, by conduct which discovered to him the dishonest designs, the *SINISTER INTENTIONS*, of the men. I must again say, that to the measures, in the first instance, Dr. Warren had no objection. Objection, did I say? He was one of their warmest supporters. He even wished that the Institution should bear the name of College, and have its regular array of Professors; a fact incidentally confirmed to me by the singular language he employs when speaking of the conduct of the Committee in proceeding to the recommendation of Officers. He calls this an attempt on their part to "*create the Faculty*."

And now, Sir, let me ask, To what do these charges amount? Are they trivial and unimportant, merely involving error in judgment? Such is very far from being their character. I can scarcely conceive of charges of greater magnitude and guilt. I will not yield to Dr. Warren in proper regard for the liberties of the Preachers and rights of the people. These rights and liberties are in my view the more sacred in that I regard them, not as the result of mutual compact, but as being, in the very highest sense, *jure divino*. He who attempts to destroy them, is not merely an enemy to that branch of the church with which he may be immediately connected, and, by sound construction, to the whole estate of Christ's church militant here on earth, but also, and chiefly, rebellious and disobedient to Christ himself, of that church the one and supreme Head. I am not going to demur to the law of the case. I admit it. I contend for it. If of faithful and wise servants the reward shall be great; * terrible, also, shall be the doom of those evil servants who say, "Our Lord delayeth his coming," and who, determining themselves to be lords over God's heritage, begin to smite their fellow-servants, thus at once giving evidence of the existence of their subjugating designs, and setting themselves in good earnest to promote* them. Sir, thus does Dr. Warren charge his brethren; with smiting their fellow-servants, with attempting to place them under an unchristian yoke: He charges them directly, and the insinuation is a very broad one, and not easily to be mistaken, that, by "pandering to the taste of fastidious hearers," by endeavouring to make religion "imposing and magnificent in the eyes of the world," "by showy chapels, and pealing organs,"—thus adopting "a carnal and worldly policy," to the entire disregard of our "original characteristic simplicity and piety,"—they are guilty of "eating with the drunken," that is, of seeking companionship with the world. The Doctor may think that all these

* Matt. xxiv. 45—51.

charges amount to nothing ; but he and his friends may rely on it, that the accused have that deep and full conviction of the responsibility and obligations of the ministerial office, that they regard the accusations as involving heavy guilt, and exposure to fearful punishment. They hope they are not unmindful of the solemn declaration, "The Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites : there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Sir, I feel this whole subject very deeply. Charges of ministerial tyranny and despotism have been lately so reiterated, and that on the most trifling occasions, that it becomes necessary to notice their character. They go to the very vitals of ministerial integrity. I have heard them repeated by those who have never suspected themselves guilty of evil-speaking in so doing. I wonder what any tradesman would say were he told that all his transactions were fraudulent, and that no man could trade with him without danger of being cheated. And yet the charge would not describe a greater sin than that of ministerial tyranny and despotism.

But, Sir, the same reasons that induce me to speak thus explicitly and strongly on the crime charged on certain Preachers by Dr. Warren and his party, induce me likewise to *speak out* on the subject of popular faction. This, too, is a high crime and misdemeanour against Christ himself, and the greatest ecclesiastical offence of which a member of a Christian church can be guilty. Faction, proved by overt acts, ought not to be tolerated for an instant in any Christian society. THE ENTIRE AND FINAL DISRUPTION OF THAT SOCIETY WERE A LESS EVIL THAN SUCH TOLERATION. A factious church is as great a curse to the world, as a peaceful and prosperous one is a blessing. A religious society torn by factious disputants, seeking to bite and devour one another, haunted by the spirit of jealousy and evil-surmisings, and seeking to hinder the maintenance of necessary discipline by clamorous intimidation, spreads a pestilential influence all around it. Such a society seems to bear more and more of the character of the field which shall be rejected, because it beareth thorns and briers, instead of bringing forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed. And when such faction seeks to acquire dominancy, then do the supporters of it share largely in the guilt of its more immediate promoters. Not they only who originate a reproach against their neighbour, but they who perpetuate it by taking it up,* are guilty before God ; nor shall they, without a penitent abandonment of their sin, abide in his tabernacle,

* Psalm xv. 3.

nor dwell in his holy hill. The men who cause divisions and offences are to be noted and avoided.

And now, Sir, that I have ascertained the nature, extent, and character of Dr. Warren's charges, I come now to examine his evidence in support of them. In doing this, I might content myself with adverting to the conduct of the Committee in their October meetings, on which he at first seems mainly to rely, and showing, that it is utterly insufficient to establish the allegations of the accuser. But I have no wish to shun the discussion of any point which he has chosen to bring forwards. If I may be allowed so to speak, I go to the jury, not for a verdict of *not proven*, but of direct, positive acquittal. I will, therefore, examine the Doctor's statements, and show, as I proceed, that some of them are notoriously, offensively incorrect, and must therefore be dismissed from the case so far as the accused are concerned, and only retained as furnishing matter of substantive and very serious charge against himself: I shall, likewise, show, that the facts which are really admitted, are utterly inapplicable, except as they prove precisely the contrary to that in support of which they are alleged. Very sorry am I to be obliged to pursue such an inquiry; but Dr. Warren's conduct leaves the friends of the Institution no other alternative than that of tacitly admitting the justice of the charges, and thus surrendering the cause which they believe it to be their duty to support, or repelling them, though that cannot be done without placing Dr. Warren in the same situation in which he has sought to place others. The invader has burnt his ships, and peace can now only be secured by conquest.

I have already shown that no suspicion whatever arises from the fact so curiously distorted by the Doctor when he speaks of "the creation of the Faculty;" the fact, that is to say, that the Committee proceeded to the recommendation of the Officers of the projected Institution. The recommendation itself I have now to consider. And it deserves note, in the very first instance, that the Committee, in October, laid down a plan, considerable modifications of which were suggested by the Provisional Committee, and acceded to by the original Committee when they re-assembled in London on the 17th of July. The first plan, as I understood it, was, that there should be three Theological Tutors, among whom, residing in separate houses, the sixty students were to be divided. In one of the meetings, during the accidental absence of Mr. Bunting, on some other business, it was proposed, and *unanimously carried*, that the general superintendency of the Institution should be vested in him. Of this Resolution Mr. Bunting was informed on his return, and he was requested to agree to it, Dr. Warren saying, "I assure you

Mr. Bunting, I heartily concur in the Resolution." He tells us, indeed, in his pamphlet, that he *voted* for Mr. Bunting. He did more. He declared his hearty concurrence. Up to this moment, therefore, all was right; for I will not believe the Doctor against himself. I am persuaded, that thus far, when it was possible a vacancy might occur at the Mission-House, he went with his brethren in reality as well as appearance. He meant what he said,—“I heartily concur in the Resolution.” After this, the Doctor rose, and addressed the Committee in a speech, in which he described the qualifications necessary for a Theological Tutor, and concluded by nominating my much-respected friend, Mr. John Burdsall. He likewise proposed Mr. Jonathan Crowther. After some discussion, however, the final Resolution of the Committee was, that the Theological Tutors should be Mr. Hannah, Mr. Galland, and Mr. Walton; and that Mr. Bunting should exercise a general superintendency over the Institution, giving a few lectures occasionally, still retaining his office as Senior Missionary Secretary. In this arrangement the Committee were unanimous, with the exception of Dr. Warren.

Now, Sir, I might content myself, if I were only concerned to get up a piece of special pleading, with saying, that, in the recommendation of the three brethren already mentioned to be Theological Tutors, there was not, there could not be, any thing to excite suspicion. I might insist on holding Dr. Warren to his hearty concurrence in the agreement to recommend Mr. Bunting, and ask the whole body of Preachers what of danger was to be apprehended from the appointment of John Hannah, Thomas Galland, and Daniel Walton? To be sure, they were on the Committee; but was it not likely that a Committee, appointed for the purposes for which this Committee was appointed, should include the men best qualified for the tutorship in question? that a Committee of Education should include the men best qualified to conduct the business of education? And if the most proper were on the Committee, were they, *for that reason*, to be passed by? The great question is, Did the Committee choose the men whom they had reason to believe, on the whole, the most qualified? Nay, Sir, I am not even bound to carry my case so far as this. I might content myself with asking whether the Committee, passing by more gifted men, did, with sinister intentions, and for corrupt purposes, choose three of their own number? And, are those sinister intentions, those corrupt purposes, *developed*, made clear and plain, *by the choice itself*? For, it must be carefully observed, up to this point, Dr. Warren himself being witness, nothing but the choice had occurred calculated to awaken suspicion, even in his mind. Sir, let all who know the parties examine the case. I am sorry to be obliged to introduce names; but I cannot

avoid it. Nor need I fear doing so. High as is the character of Messrs. Burdsall and Crowther;—and by none is it more highly estimated than myself;—I know both the private excellence and public worth of the men;—I am happy to reckon them among the number of my friends;—and the recollections of the time spent in their society are with me among the most pleasant recollections of by-gone days;—but, high as their characters most indisputably stand, not even to *them* is it matter of disparagement that the Committee resolved, on the whole, to fix their choice on Messrs. Hannah, Galland, and Walton. Now, what was there in *this* choice to awaken suspicion? The only question to be decided was that of qualification; and I am perfectly satisfied that, apart from this unhappy dispute which has subsequently arisen, the choice of the Committee would have been confirmed by the suffrages of the Preachers, and the hearty approbation of the people.

So far, then, as these three brethren are concerned, the case clearly presents no ground for suspicion. Does it become altered by the addition of Mr. Bunting's name? No, surely; for in his nomination the Doctor "heartily concurred." But I will not avail myself even of this. It is against Mr. Bunting that the Doctor's remarks are really directed. Only, to make out his case of *sinister intention*, he must prove, either that the three brethren in question are equally desirous with their associate to subvert the liberties of the Body, or that such is their imbecility that they would be his fit and ready tools. But is this, in point of fact, their character? Few men are better known among us; and the statement of such a suspicion is sufficiently refuted by the mention of their names. And the same argument holds good as to the Committee. I take the fifteen names which remain after Dr. Warren's and those of the four brethren are subtracted; and, appealing to the whole body of the Preachers, I ask, Are these brethren capable of the conduct attributed to them by Dr. Warren? Mistaken they might be; but with mistake he does not charge them. He charges them with dishonesty; but no one who knows them will believe him, even for a moment.

I may seem, Sir, unnecessarily to have laboured on this point. I may be told that Dr. Warren, a Preacher of thirty years' standing, a man represented by his friends as so transcendent in ability, so amiable in temper, could not mean thus to accuse his brethren, thus to drag them before the church and the world, as guilty of a crime of no ordinary magnitude. I think I have shown, by copious extracts from the pamphlet, that he *has* so accused them. I may not be able to account for this. I may see in it a line of conduct utterly at variance with former character. But still there is the fact. That,

to me, is indubitable. If words have meaning, Dr. Warren has publicly charged the Committee with attempting, under pretence of an Institution, to establish an unmethodistical, unchristian dominancy, subversive of the liberties of the Connexion. Since I wrote those paragraphs of my letter which contain the Doctor's charges, circumstances have occurred, which would have banished doubt, had any doubt remained. Dr. Warren's friends are resolved to supply a comment on his text. The communications from Manchester, to which I have referred, having been animadverted upon by an able writer, in the "Times," signing himself Vindex, has been defended by a person with the signature M. This writer represents himself as having been long and intimately acquainted with Dr. Warren, and as being on terms of confidential intercourse with him. I may doubt the justness of the elaborate encomiums he pronounces, even while I may respect the feelings which prompted them. With the facts of the case I would fain hope he is utterly unacquainted. The letter of Vindex I never saw, nor, indeed, heard of, till it was shown me on the evening of the day on which it was published. He has well exposed the shameless calumnies of the former communication, and they who have witnessed the whole proceedings know that M.'s letter is any thing rather than a reply. I only refer to his communication because he places himself among the Doctor's intimate friends, and tells the editor of the paper that his name and address (sent, no doubt, with the letter) will guarantee his responsibility for his observations. He quite justifies me in my conclusions, and accuses the Committee of "*blind subserviency to one individual*," and of "*shocking duplicity*." I thank the Doctor's friend for thus assisting me to put the case on its right foundation. Whence all this outcry about the Doctor as an individual so wantonly attacked, so greatly injured? Sir, had he been quiet, no one would have disturbed his quietness. He is the first mover in the business. Without provocation he has chosen, most deliberately chosen, to do all in his power to destroy the character of several of his brethren, and particularly of one among them. That individual he has charged with *basely wicked conduct*. To have preferred such charges without foundation is itself base wickedness. He has done this without provocation. The term, "unprincipled opposition," was explained when used, and the explanation was accepted. And as to what he calls "the silly calumny of the credulous Secretary," which the Manchester communication in the Times calls a *public accusation* brought against him at the Conference, and which the same correspondent gives as one of the reasons why the speech was delivered *some days before*,—the cause thus occurring some time *after* the effect,—the Doctor's friend now acknowledges that "Dr. Warren's

pamphlet nowhere sanctions the idea that Mr. Newton 'publicly' affronted him with his gross insinuation." The Doctor comes forward gratuitously to slander men, some of whom are older than himself, and not one of whom is inferior to him, even should his talents be as splendid as his friend asserts; and he is not to complain of the consequences of his own act. He is the accuser of his brethren by his own choice; and worse accusations cannot be brought against Christian Ministers than those which he has advanced. "He has convicted them," says his intimate friend, "of **DELIBERATELY** publishing and circulating a **FALSEHOOD**." If the accused turn round on him, and retort his charges, he is not to complain of ill-usage. Falsehood certainly has been deliberately published and circulated; *by whom*, the readers of my letter will see before I have done.

I now proceed with the narrative. The October Committee broke up, utterly unconscious that Dr. Warren's dissent extended any farther than the nominations. Beyond that point it was not signified by him, and the members whom I have had the opportunity of consulting never suspected that it went beyond. After the Committee had concluded their deliberations, my old friend, Mr. Hannah, came to see me, then lying on a sick bed, my recovery from which was very doubtful. Aware how much I was interested in the subject, he narrated the proceedings, in which, he stated, the Preachers had been unanimous, except in the nomination of officers, from which, he said, Dr. Warren had dissented. I have since asked whether he even suspected that the Doctor had become a dissentient as to the whole plan, and he has most distinctly assured me that he did not. Mr. Hannah, as one of the Secretaries, was appointed to draw up a general account of the deliberations of the Committee, and of the results in which they had issued. This he did, and the account was published in the "Proposals" already mentioned. It is in connexion with the preparation of this account that the circumstance occurred on which Dr. Warren grounds his charge of "*artifice*," and his friend, that of *deliberately-published and circulated falsehood*. Very glad am I that this charge refers exclusively to Mr. Hannah. He is well known to be incapable of either falsehood or artifice. He acted, as every one who knows him will feel satisfied that he did, with perfect simplicity and good faith throughout the whole transaction; and charges of this sort, directed against a man of such unimpeachable character, only recoil upon their authors. It was in the month of February that his pamphlet was ready for the press. Wishing to secure its accuracy, it was circulated among such members of the Committee as resided within a convenient distance of Liverpool. Along with this was sent the Resolution of the Committee on the subject of the Officers. Some of the persons

named felt unwilling that their names should appear in this stage of the proceedings, and, therefore, Mr. Hannah thought it would be as well to omit them from the published proceedings. In about three weeks the manuscript was returned to him, and, on looking it over, he perceived that in one place the word "*not*" had been inserted, in *ink*; by *whom*, he knew not; nor does he even now know except by reasonable inference. I must give the whole sentence, that it may be clearly seen on what the charge of *artifice and falsehood* does actually rest.

"The members of the Committee are fully sensible that the office assigned them was not finally to decide upon any measure, but to collect all the information which lay within their reach, and to use the best of their judgment in forming such a preparatory outline of instruction as they might, with some degree of confidence, submit to the inspection of the ensuing Conference. As they deem it exceedingly desirable that the object of their deliberations should be carefully investigated, and distinctly understood, by all who take an interest in the more extensive success of the Methodist ministry, they are induced to issue the substance and results of their inquiries, in a separate pamphlet, for immediate circulation through the *Connexion*. It is proper to add that they communicate their views with an unaffected deference to the sentiments of others. (N.B.) Sincerely as they can avow that they publish nothing which they have not sedulously considered, and that they were unanimous in their conclusions, yet they are by no means disposed to maintain *their own scheme** with unbecoming tenacity. If any other can be devised, which shall accomplish the end proposed with greater facility and effect, they will cheerfully concur in its support." (*Proposals, &c.*, p. 4.)

Now, on this the question arises, Did Mr. Hannah, when he wrote as above,—"*Sincerely as they can avow, that they were unanimous in their conclusions,*"—mean to impose on the *Connexion* by deliberately asserting a falsehood? Or, did he merely intend to refer to the opinions of the Committee as to the preferable methods for the instruction of the junior Preachers? With the first Dr. Warren charges him. Sir, I am not ashamed to confess that while I am writing, with the subject and charge fairly before me, I have to repress the feelings that unavoidably arise when such conduct is ascribed to one who has been so long my personal friend, and whom I well know to be utterly incapable of it. He did not think that any importance whatever was to be attached to the *publication* or *non-publication* of the names, and when the manuscript

* The expression evidently shows to what the "*sedulous consideration*" and "*unanimous conclusions*" refer.

was returned, with the word "*not*," inserted before "unanimous," he declares he did not know what was intended by it; especially as the insertion turned the whole sentence into nonsense, as will easily be seen by reading it with the interlineation. Dr. Warren was at Manchester, Mr. Hannah at Liverpool; yet, instead of writing to the Secretary who had written the Proposals, who was close at hand, and who could, in a few hours, have had an interview with him, he chose to write to the other Secretary, resident in London, and to whom the task of preparing the Conclusions for publication had not been committed. And, in this first letter, without seeking any explanation from Mr. Hannah, whom he might have seen by the rail-road in a couple of hours, he advances the charge of ARTIFICE; surely no trivial one. In the sense which the words evidently were intended to express, they are true. Of Dr. Warren's dissent no suspicion was as yet entertained, and Mr. Hannah was justified in publishing that in their "Conclusions," then to be submitted to the public, they were unanimous. THEY WERE SO. If, indeed, the pamphlet had been a formal Report, simply containing the Resolutions of the Committee, and it had been expressly declared that they had been unanimous in all their proceedings, the case would have been somewhat different. As it is, Mr. Hannah, in publishing for consideration certain "Conclusions," only states that though the Committee publish nothing but what they have seriously considered, and in which they were unanimous, yet they are willing, if it be shown to be proper, to modify, or even to alter their opinions. Such is the plain meaning, the honest reference of the sentence, which the members of the Committee in London, therefore, notwithstanding the Doctor's protest, did right to retain. Up to this time no suspicion was entertained that he had altered his mind as to the *principle* of the Institution. Mr. Hannah's assertion to me is distinct and positive, that he simply meant what I have already stated, and nothing more; and that of any thing in the shape of *artifice* he never dreamt. Sir, my friend is a man of too high honour to be capable of even imagining such meanness. The charge is not, in the least degree, proved; but I will not leave it there; I deny it; explicitly, and on consultation with Mr. Hannah, I assert its utter groundlessness.

I am not aware that any thing material to the case occurred till the 17th of July. In June the Provisional Committee met, and, having carefully examined the proposals and plans agreed to in October, resolved to recommend certain modifications of them. July 17th the October Committee met, according to appointment, to receive the report of the Provisional Committee. At that meeting I was present. A day or two before I had heard, that it was reported that Dr. Warren was coming up to London with the

intention of opposing the whole plan. I confess, Sir, that this excited my surprise, but it did not prepare me for the opposition I subsequently witnessed. I beg attention to the posture of affairs as it then existed. Dr. Warren's dissent from the nomination of Officers was known ; against his brethren he had preferred a charge of artifice ; and it was now rumoured that he was going to extend his dissent to those parts of the plan to which he had before agreed. Thus did things stand when the two Committees assembled on the 17th of July. When the meeting had been opened, and the Minutes of the Provisional Committee confirmed in the usual way, that is, as being a true record of proceedings, Mr. Bunting asked whether the Doctor was, or whether he was not, friendly to the *principle* of a measure, *modifications* of which were about to be proposed. I wish this employment of the word "*principle*" to be specially noted ; more depends on it than may at first appear. To this inquiry, as I have before stated, the Doctor evaded a direct reply. Conversations, immediately growing out of this, occupied the Committee for above an hour. In the course of it, Mr. Bunting observed that this was not a question as between himself and the Doctor. "It is not," said Mr. B., "against *me*, or *my* connexion with the Institution, that he objects." The Doctor, so far from disputing this, *most unequivocally admitted it*, as well as that he had *fully concurred in recommending an Institution*. After several persons, as I have already stated, had endeavoured to elicit a reply, the one was given which I have mentioned before : "In consequence of the *disingenuous* and *interested* conduct which has been practised, I have, certainly, changed my opinion ;" thus explicitly declaring, *for the first time*, his dissent from the *principle* of the plan. It was *after* these evasions ; *after* the charge of *artifice* had been noticed and refuted ; *after* this new charge of *disingenuous and interested conduct* had been made ; at a time when the Doctor had given no other reason for his conduct ; at a time, therefore, when his opposition would appear inexplicable ; after a conversation, too, in which the term "*principle*" had been so frequently employed in reference, not to conduct, but to *measures* ; it was then that Mr. Bunting, referring to Dr. Warren's reply, used the words about which such an outcry has been made. He did *not* use them "*furiously*," as the Doctor has said. He said, and he well might say, "This is the most unprincipled opposition* I ever knew ; and I speak advisedly." As to the manner in which this was spoken, I meet Dr. Warren's assertion with a direct denial. They were spoken *earnestly* ; ~~not~~ *furiously* they were

* "Unprincipled opposition," not "unprincipled conduct," as the Manchester correspondent actually quoted it, and as the Doctor's friends wish it to be understood.

not spoken. I was present at the time ; and, as a present witness, I solemnly declare the Doctor's description to be an untrue one. But this is not all. With evident intention to deceive his readers, the Doctor has, in the first place, omitted a fact essential to the right understanding of the case ; and, in the second place, he has said that the expressions were used at a time when they were *not* used, and when he must have known they were not used.

I say, first, that there is a suppression of an important fact. Mr. Bunting *immediately* added, "Observe, I do not mean *bad principle*, but *without principle*." This explanation was not given because the Doctor complained of the words. No time was allowed for this. The explanation was given at once ; without solicitation, and without delay. The sense in which the expression was used was thus given at the time ; and Dr. Warren was so far from objecting to the explanation, that he said, with a smile and a bow, "I EXPECTED NO LESS FROM THE WELL-KNOWN CANDOUR OF MR. BUNTING." I give you the words, Sir, as I heard them myself. Now, Sir, in all fairness, if an ambiguous word is used in the course of debate, and the person using it, *at the time*, and *without solicitation*, explains the sense in which he uses it, he is to be understood as having used it in that sense. This explanation Mr. Bunting then gave ; and the explanation so given Dr. Warren has omitted ; he has thus been guilty of the "*suppressio veri*." But is this suppression of truth a material fact ? Undoubtedly it is. The explanation distinctly refers the word to measures, not conduct ; whereas the Doctor carefully represents it as containing a charge against himself, personally. Now, with the explanation, he knew the charge could not be sustained ; he has therefore withheld it. That I am not charging the Doctor untruly, in saying that he has withheld the explanation to suit his own purpose, is proved by one or two passages in the pamphlet : "It was on this occasion that Mr. Bunting first presumed, amidst the surprised silence of the Committee,* to insinuate that I was under the influence of some mean, some unhal- lowed motive." (Page 7.) Mr. Bunting having carefully said, "Observe, I do NOT mean BAD PRINCIPLE." So again in the printed speech : "I think it due to myself, and to the cause which I advocate, in all fairness, just to notice the disingenuous insinuation made by that individual, (Mr. Bunting,) and made, too, in a mixed Committee of lay Gentlemen and of Preachers,† in order to impugn

* "Surprised silence!" What does the Doctor mean ? Will he venture to repeat this assertion in the presence of Messrs. Haslope, Farmer, Buttress, Hunter, Elliott, Hoby, Wilde, Kruse, and others ? After omitting to tell the *whole* truth, he now tells something *more* than the truth.

† "Mixed Committee." True ; according to a Resolution to which Dr. Warren had agreed.

my motives : As though my opposition arose out of disappointed ambition, or something worse !” all this while the Doctor being aware that Mr. Bunting had said that he did *not* impugn Dr. Warren’s motives. “I do NOT mean BAD principle.” If the Doctor had *forgotten* the two expressions, so vitally important in the controversy,—“Observe, I do not mean *bad principle*, but *without principle* ;” and, “I expected no less from Mr. Bunting’s well-known candour ;”—then is *his memory not to be trusted*. If he *did* remember them, and, remembering them, purposely omitted them, that so the case might wear another aspect, then, Sir, painful as is the alternative, I cannot avoid the conclusion, *his word is not to be taken*.

Taking, then, the expression “unprincipled,” in the sense at the time given to it, was it inapplicable ? On what principle, I ask, would it appear, at that time, to rest ? In the formation of an Institution he had fully concurred ; expressing an opinion that it should be called *a College*. No objection to Mr. Bunting’s appointment had then been stated ; so far from it, that the Doctor did not dispute the fact of his concurrence. And could it be seriously supposed that he saw something so objectionable in Mr. Hannah’s appointment, that, on that account only, he was now going to oppose what he had formerly, in fact, *recently*, within a few months, recommended ? Nothing had at that time been said about monstrous combinations of offices ; nothing of sinister intentions ; nothing of the threatened liberties of the Connexion. There was nothing but a vague charge, apparently resting on nothing but the *explained* fact on which the charge of artifice was built, of “disingenuous and interested conduct.” And because of this he was renouncing his former judgment ! Sir, if this was not opposition without principle, nothing can be so. I admit that the subsequent disclosures of the pamphlet put the matter in another form. The opposition is *now* seen to have a principle : Of its character, I say nothing.

I have said, Sir, that the Doctor states the expression, “unprincipled,” to have been used at a time when it was not used. He wishes to represent Mr. Bunting as acting, in the meeting of the 17th of July, on a preconcerted scheme ; and that one part of “the shifting, and even contradictory, policy pursued to induce him to change his purpose,” (page 11,) was an attempt to entrap him into a surrender of “the principle of his opposition.” Such policy had no existence, Sir. The fact which is mentioned was viewed by me, at the time, in a very different light. This is the Doctor’s account of it : “Then, in the next place, the ingenious courtesy with which I was solicited, again and again, to accompany certain friends of the Institution on a mission, which, had I consented to go, would have implicated me as having yielded the principle of my opposition.”

(*Ibid.*) The fact, you will recollect, was this: The Meeting had agreed that the opportunity of securing the premises at Hoxton was very important; but, as nothing could be said on the subject, conclusively, till the Conference had come to a decision upon it, it was resolved that a deputation should wait on the persons with whom the negotiation for the premises would have to be conducted, for the purpose of stating to them how the case stood. When the deputation had been agreed upon, Mr. Bunting did, with much kindness of manner, request that Dr. Warren would accompany them. The request was courteously made, and, to all appearance, courteously declined. I do not believe that the courtesy on the part of Mr. Bunting was at all assumed. It was *evidently sincere*. The assertion that it was "ingenious courtesy" is against appearances, and without proof. But what are we to say, Sir, of what follows? "And, lastly, *when this scheme did not succeed*, the insulting manner in which my opposition was furiously denounced by him as being the most unprincipled which he ever knew." (Page 11.) Sir, Dr. Warren does here positively and unequivocally assert that his opposition was denounced as unprincipled *after* Mr. Bunting had requested him to join the deputation. "When this scheme did not succeed,"—"my opposition was furiously denounced by him." Now, Sir, was it so? Surely, surely, Dr. Warren's memory must have most utterly failed him. AT LEAST AN HOUR had elapsed AFTER the term "unprincipled opposition" had been used and explained, when this "ingenious courtesy," as Dr. Warren insidiously calls it, was tried. Sir, is the notice of the due order of events in a narrative no part of truth? Is a man at liberty even to reverse that order, and then, *on that reversed order*, to ground an argument? Yet this is the line of opposition pursued by Dr. Warren. Where the mind is not warped by prejudice, there will be no hesitation in assigning to that opposition its proper character.

I have already spoken of the Great Queen-Street Meeting. I come now to notice the events which occurred at Conference; events of which all the Preachers present were witnesses, and to them I appeal as to the fidelity of my statements.

It was on Tuesday, the 5th of August, that the Report of the Education Committee was presented to the Conference; and it was moved by Mr. Leach that the Conference should agree to the recommendation of the Committee for the Establishment of an Institution. The *principle* of the measure was now in debate, and was well stated and defended by the mover of the Resolution, and Mr. Slater, by whom it was seconded. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the continuance of the debate was postponed till the next day. Before the discussion was renewed on the Wednesday, the Preachers

were reminded by yourself, that there were other important matters to which they would have to attend, and that it would be necessary for them to confine their remarks to the motion before them. Dr. Warren having risen to propose his amendment, Mr. Robert Wood inquired whether it were really decorous for him thus to come forward in opposition to a recommendation to which he had previously consented. A short conversation ensued, ending in this, that he had, of course, the right both to propose his amendment, and to address the Conference upon it. He says, he had to contend for upwards of an hour for the right of being heard; but this is of a piece with his other assertions. Mr. Wood's very natural question is transformed into a *coup de main*, and he himself is thus placed among the conspirators against the Doctor. When any thing like proof of this is brought forward, it will be time enough to meet it. Dr. Warren now commenced his address, and soon made it apparent that his grand object was to make an attack on others; and especially to indulge himself in slanderous insinuations against Mr. Bunting. He was called to order, as wandering entirely from the question before the brethren. He now tells us, that his design was to vindicate his motives from the calumny which Mr. Bunting had been permitted openly, and without restraint, to fix upon him. Sir, I repeat it, his *motives* had not been attacked; and all who had heard the expression of which he complains *now*, had heard the DIRECT explanation, and his own courteous acknowledgment of Mr. Bunting's candour. At the time to which I am now referring, Dr. Warren was the only person who had *calumniated motives*. He commenced the attack himself, by accusing those whom he calls in his speech "the *honourable* members of the Committee," both of "artifice," and of "disingenuous and interested conduct" in the discharge of their duty; accusations which involve the very worst meaning of the term "unprincipled;" whereas, he had only been told that his own opposition to a measure which he had warmly recommended was *without principle*. When the Doctor sought to slander others in his speech, he was *not* acting in self-defence, but, in point of fact, maintaining his former character of accuser. Being called to order, he appealed to you, and you decided against him; but he immediately pursued the same line of remark. He was again called to order, and again did the Chair decide against him. He seemed evidently resolved on forcing the Preachers to listen to his remarks, in defiance both of your own decisions, and the evident feeling of a large majority of the Preachers. Cries of "Order," and "Chair," now resounded from all sides; and this is what he chooses to call "obstreperous clamour," and "the most indecent and unmannerly uproar that he ever witnessed in a Public Meeting." He had

appealed to the Chair, and the decision was against him. This he himself admits, though in terms the most insulting to yourself; telling us that he was *refused*,—the right of self-defence, *having never been accused*,—UNDER PRETENCE of his being out of order. He at last said, “Mr. President, am I not to be heard?” I well recollect your reply: “Dr. Warren, you shall be heard, provided you confine yourself to the motion before the Conference, which goes to the principle of an Institution. I cannot sit here, and listen to these personal attacks, grounded on what might have happened in a Committee. If you have any objections against the persons recommended to fill certain offices, you can state them when that question comes before the Conference. But you must now confine yourself to the motion, that the recommendation of an Institution be agreed to.” The Doctor then said, that, since he had been refused the liberty of vindicating himself, he should reserve to himself the right of doing it in the way he might judge proper. He then proceeded to argue against the Institution, and was, as is well known, heard without farther interruption, though he still chose to throw in his insinuations against his brethren. Sir, among the important facts omitted, this is one; that of all who spoke on the Doctor’s side of the question, he only was interrupted. How was this? Did the friends of the Institution fear no one but Dr. Warren? Mr. Bromley seconded the amendment; why was not *his* speech interrupted? Why not Mr. Burdsall’s, Mr. James Wood’s, Mr. Haswell’s, Mr. Rowland’s? How was it that the clamourers for an Institution did not honour *these* brethren by indecent and unmannerly interruption? The reason is plain. They spoke to the question; and, as is well known, were heard with silent attention. If the Doctor had wished to bring the subject of the only one instance of attack upon himself which even he can adduce, (and which, as explained at the time, was not an attack,) why was it not done when the proceedings of the Conference required it,—when Mr. Bunting’s name was called over, along with those of the other Preachers? And had Dr. Warren even chosen to do this through the District Meeting to which Mr. Bunting belonged, there was sufficient time between the 17th of July and the beginning of Conference (the 30th) for the Chairman to have convened the Preachers. The Doctor believed,—so his pamphlet professes,—that Mr. Bunting was engaged in a plan to subvert the liberties of the Connexion; why did he not bring his charge forward when it could have been fairly met by the accused? That this was not done, is not to be attributed to forbearance. The pamphlet shows, that, when exasperated, the Doctor knows not to have mercy. Sir, had the charge been brought forward *thus*, he knew he must bring witnesses to substantiate it. He well knew that

he could not find them, and that thus his charge would have recoiled upon himself. He chose, therefore, to endeavour to bring it in indirectly, and on the discussion of another question, when witnesses as to the fact could not be examined. Besides, omitting all reference to this point of witnesses, had the Doctor been allowed to *attack*, those whom he attacked would have had the right of *defence*. Others, too, might have claimed the same privilege of wandering into subjects of crimination and defence ; and then, what would the discussion have been ? and how would it have assisted the Preachers to come to a right decision on the important question before them ? It was in the highest degree proper that the debate on the *principle* of such a question should be conducted in reference to its grand object, unmingled with those personalities, which could only draw the attention of the Preachers from the point to be decided, or, by exciting their feelings to undue warmth, prevent them from deciding with that calmness which the importance of the subject required. I say, then, in the first place, that the Doctor had not been attacked ; and, therefore, vindication was needless. I say, secondly, that, even had he been attacked, an opportunity of vindication, equally favourable to the accuser and the accused, was presented when Mr. Bunting's name was called over in the usual way. I say, thirdly, that upon the question then before the brethren, personal vindication would have led to very inconvenient results. And I add, that, when the names of the persons recommended to fill office in the Institution were proposed, another opportunity was presented for the statement of the Doctor's charges. Sir, when he might have been heard, he would not seek to be heard ; and he only so sought when he could not be heard without manifold inconvenience. Here, too, his charges against you of sinfully gross partiality in the discharge of your duty, and against his brethren for conduct unbefitting their character as Christian Ministers, entirely fail.

In the prosecution of my painful task of following the Doctor through his "faithful detail of facts," I now come to the close of the debate. Of this, too, he has given an account quite after his own manner. He says, "The Rev. Messrs. Beaumont and Everett rose at the same time to address the Conference in favour of the Amendment, (having *purposely* reserved themselves to so late a period,) but such was the impatience of part of the assembly to urge the debate to an immediate conclusion, that they could not be heard." The evident design of this passage is to show that these brethren were improperly prevented from speaking by those who were opposed to the Amendment. What, then, are the *real* facts of the case ; facts well known to the whole Conference ? As is usual in discussions of such a nature, the Preachers intending to speak on the

question had sent up their names¹ to be inserted in a list kept by yourself; so that they were called upon in the order in which they had so sent up their names. In this list Messrs. Beaumont and Everett had *not* caused their names to be inserted. They "*purposely reserved themselves* to so late a period." To so late a period! How late? The Doctor forgets that he had before said nothing about either early or late. He thus lets the truth slip out, that the non-insertion of the names of these brethren was intentional; they had arranged to have the list exhausted, and then to have claimed the right of addressing the Conference. That right, in the abstract, under such circumstances, I am not going to deny; I only observe, that there was an arranged plan to gain for these two brethren the opportunity of reply upon all the foregone speakers. Perhaps, Sir, *this plan was suspected at the time*; but I scarcely expected that the Doctor would have thus published it. Sir, had they spoken, they would not have secured their object. Utterly unused to take any public share in Conference debates, I had refused the requests of several esteemed friends to send my own name up to you for insertion; but when *this* plan was reported among the Preachers, I said, that if Mr. Beaumont spoke, under such circumstances, I should feel it my duty to request the attention of the brethren to a few observations from myself.

But, Sir, were they, as the Doctor would have us believe, prevented from speaking? You well know, that, towards what afterwards proved to be the close of the debate, there was a general and repeated call for Mr. Bunting to speak; and that in reply to this call he said, that as Dr. Warren's insinuations had been so grossly and personally insulting, he would not speak; and in this refusal he persisted. Yourself, Sir, then, in reference to numerous cries for the question to be put, reminded the Preachers that it was near the regular hour for adjournment; and asked whether it was their pleasure that the debate should be resumed at their next sitting. The reply to this was by another very general cry of "*question.*" At this time, Sir, you had on your list the names of several Preachers who had not spoken, and among them, of Preachers who intended to support the original motion. You told the Conference that you must have the consent of the Preachers, whose names were on the list, to waive their right. Mr. Lessey, one of them, said, that he thought the question had been fully debated, and that the Preachers were prepared for an immediate decision; adding, that if the speakers on the other side would waive their right, he would give up his, but not else. To this effect they all replied. Mr. Everett then said that he had intended to speak, but that he would give up,

provided none spoke on the other side. And thus did the debate close by *mutual agreement*. If Messrs. Beaumont and Everett thus gave up their right to speak, so did Messrs. Lessey and Bowers. Dr. Warren, leaving out all these material facts, would represent one part of the assembly to have been so impatient to bring the matter to a close, as not to give to the speakers on his side an opportunity of expressing their opinions. Sir, the farther I go in his pamphlet, the more clearly do I see that in his representations of fact he is never to be trusted.

I should say no more as to the close of the debate, but for another of the Doctor's insinuations. He would represent the majority as far less than has been stated. Some one hundred and fifty or two hundred Preachers, according to his own account, were neutral; that is, that half the number of the Preachers present did not vote at all. It is a pity that he did not call for a division at the time. My friend Mr. Crowther and myself were, at the time of the vote, on opposite sides of the chapel. We had good opportunities of judging, and he declares, in his Reply to the Doctor's pamphlet, that his decided opinion is, that very few were neutral. This is my own firm persuasion. The hands raised in favour of the motion were held up some time, and an attempt was made to count them, but it could not be done. This, however, is not the whole. Why, Sir, even upon so comparatively unimportant a point, has Dr. Warren CHOSEN to omit a material fact? You will recollect, Sir, that a day or two afterwards this very report was brought before the Conference; and one of the Preachers in the minority was asked if it were true that *he* had said that a couple of hundred Preachers had not voted at all. He admitted that he had. No one, however, ventured to support him in this opinion. I am sure that the general sense of the Conference was against him. But, beside other contradictions, that given by Mr. Waddy, sen., was the most important. *He had voted in the minority. He was seated on the platform:* He had, therefore, a full view of the Preachers. On hearing what had been said, he rose, and, in a manner very honourable to himself, stated that *his* testimony could not be considered as partial; that he had paid close attention to the vote when it was taken; and that he was bound in justice to say, that he believed there were very few of the Preachers who had not voted one way or the other. If the Doctor was not satisfied, why did he not call for some method of verifying the opinion of his three friends? With their evidently immense majority the friends of the Institution were satisfied, as well as with the testimony very honourably borne to the correctness of their opinion after it had been, not in the most honourable manner, called in question. It was the Doctor's interest to lessen the com-

puted majority to the smallest number possible ; and if two hundred could have been subtracted from it, lessened it would have been. The circumstance may be considered as scarcely worth notice, but it affords an instance of that unfairness and misrepresentation in which the Doctor indulges on every subject.

Another instance occurs in his reference to the memorials presented against the measure. He says, " That serious alarms and dissatisfactions were prevailing among the people, was evident in not a few remonstrances, which, only in *anticipation** that such steps might be taken, were sent to the Conference from highly respectable quarters, but which were not even *read*.* One only exception is to be made ; but that is one of a very serious character, and the circumstances of which *imperatively demanded a hearing*."* (Page 33.) Sir, you well know that the charge against you of having thus neglected your duty is founded on a *practical falsehood*. Of all sorts of falsehood that is the worst which intentionally "*palters with us in a double sense* ;" marking, as it does, the deliberate intention to deceive. I have quoted this sentence to several persons inclining to the Doctor's side of the question, and asked them what they understood it to mean. The uniform reply has been, that the memorials were passed by without notice. To your care, Sir, as President, were they intrusted ; and the Preachers at the next Conference will bear you witness that you discharged your trust faithfully. I well remember seeing you come forward with a bundle of papers in your hand ; and hearing you say, that you had a number of letters on various subjects to be laid before the Conference ; that perhaps it would be sufficient if you stated what was the subject of each, and from whom it came ; that if any Preacher wished any one to be read at full length, you would read it ; and that if they wished that *all* should be thus read, so it should be. You then read, as you had at first proposed ; and thus, all the letters were laid before the Conference in the same way that petitions are read by the Clerk in Parliament. And yet, says the Doctor, they "*WERE NOT EVEN READ*." And now for the exception. His account would lead his readers to suppose that there were in it some circumstances which obliged even you to attend to them. "*The circumstances of which IMPERATIVELY DEMANDED A HEARING*." Twelve London Trustees, one of whom was well known to be bitterly hostile to Mr. Bunting, (a fact, the knowledge of which by many was announced when his name was read, by cries of Hear, hear !) presented a memorial against the Institution which you placed among the rest ; and when you had laid all before the Conference, Dr. Warren requested that *that* might be read in full. It was read accordingly.

* These Italics are the Doctor's.

And if any others had been called for, they likewise would have been read in the same manner. Why did not Dr. Warren propose that they should *all* be read in full? Did he allow them to be read *short*, that he might have the opportunity of publishing that they were not read at all?

To three very gross misrepresentations respecting Mr. Bunting, I have now to direct your attention. On one occasion, according to the Doctor, Mr. Bunting uttered “these *remarkable words*, at the highest pitch of his voice, and with a violence of gesticulation which gave serious alarm to his friends for his personal safety.” Just in passing, Sir, I would say that this description of manner is a *gross falsehood*, and that is all the notice it deserves. I would remark, however, that I have now lived long enough to know that great earnestness of manner is consistent with great kindness of feeling, and that an address smooth almost to fawning may cover fearful malignity. I proceed, however, to “these remarkable words.” Mr. Bunting *did* say, and he said very earnestly,—having been grossly insulted by such insinuations as the Doctor and *some* of his friends were capable of making, that he had sought power for bad purposes,—he *did* say, that he had not sought this office; that he had been solicited to accept it; and that he had consented very reluctantly that he should be included in the recommendation of Officers; but that, since such unworthy motives had been attributed to him, he would not accept it unless the Preachers should insist on his acceptance, with the threat of expulsion if he did not consent. Sir, every Preacher present knows that the point of acceptance was pressed, *earnestly pressed*, on Mr. Bunting after this; and that for some time he held out against all their requests. You will remember, Sir, that, with a view to bring this matter to a conclusion, I rose, and proposed a motion to this effect, that the Conference *specially and earnestly* requested Mr. Bunting to take the general superintendency of the Institution, by whatever name the office might be called. And I said that I did this, that the Preachers might have the opportunity of showing their wishes by their vote. I am confident, Sir, that this Resolution would have been carried *all but* unanimously. With the exception of Dr. Warren and *some* of his friends, there was but one opinion on this subject, that, if there was to be an Institution, the general superintendence would be best entrusted to Mr. Bunting. I did not press the motion, because Mr. Bunting *then* agreed to take the subject into serious consideration, to consult with the other Preachers recommended as Officers, and in conjunction with them to give a reply.

The next misrepresentation relates to the *name* of the office. That there had been no *scheming*, is pretty plain from this,—that

as yet no name had been agreed upon. The *pastoral care* of the students had been committed to Mr. Entwisle, and their *instruction* to Mr. Hannah. It was a general superintendence that the Preachers wished Mr. Bunting to exercise. The term *Visitor* was mentioned ; and some copies of the Stations were circulated with *this* : Dr. Warren says "*unfortunately*." Really, Sir, I cannot tell what he means. He would insinuate that the word did not convey the idea of sufficient *power*, and was *therefore* objected to by Mr. Bunting and his friends. Sir, if *power* had been Mr. Bunting's object, in the sense in which Dr. Warren employs the term, the word "*VISITOR*" would have satisfied him, however voracious his ambition might be. Our English Colleges, Sir, have their Heads, Wardens, Principals, Presidents, &c. But the Visitor of the College has, in fact, authority in the last resort. This signification of the term, however applicable to public institutions for instruction, is not often adverted to in ordinary conversation. Sunday-schools and other charities have their Visitors, whose work is simply to call from time to time and see how things are going on. The less ambiguous term, "*President*," was therefore agreed upon.

With this is connected a third misrepresentation. The Doctor says, "Upon farther consideration, however, and especially upon Mr. Bunting's express declaration that he would not accept of office 'unless *power* was connected with it,' the change was made from the designation of *Visitor* to that of *President*." I have already shown that the term *Visitor* implies as much power as *President*. I now notice the artful misrepresentation of Mr. Bunting's language. He did not say that he would not have office, generally, without power. He spoke of the importance of the Institution ; of what had been said of the danger that might result from congregating young men together for purposes such as those proposed by the Institution ; of the necessity of keeping them in order, that the apprehended evils might be prevented, as well as that their studies might be duly prosecuted ; he said, that, in order to this, it was absolutely necessary that whoever had the general superintendence of the Institution should have sufficient authority to do what would be required from him. "You have given me," he added, "an office of great responsibility ; and I will not accept office unless I have power to discharge the duties connected with it." In words to this effect it is well known that he spoke. If Dr. Warren only meant to tell his readers this, why omit the reference to responsibility ? The evident intention, however, is, by presenting a mutilated sentence, to give confirmation to his continual insinuations respecting Mr. Bunting's overbearing and ambitious temper.

I have now shown, Sir, that the suspicions which Dr. Warren's pamphlet expresses are utterly groundless, and that his statements of

the facts by which he would justify those suspicions are grossly misrepresented : It will, therefore, follow that the arguments which he bases upon such groundless suspicions and misrepresented facts are of no value whatsoever. Before I conclude, I will, however, notice and explain two or three general subjects which the Doctor, after his manner, entirely and injuriously misrepresents. He lays great stress on what he considers to be the improper combination of different offices in the same individual. The simple facts of the case to which he refers are very plain. Mr. Bunting is the senior Secretary of the Missions ; he is, at the same time, President of the Institution. As Mission-Secretary, the entire department of duty devolving on him will no doubt furnish him with sufficient occupation. But if, among the duties to which he has to attend, there are some which require the employment of his own talents and time, there will be others, of course, which can as easily be performed by another person. For this case the Conference provided. The Minutes state, " that if it should be found necessary to supply Mr. Bunting's occasional ' lack of service ' at the Mission-House, in consequence of the time and assistance which he may gratuitously afford to this Institution, by additional help of any kind, the expense of such help, or of any new arrangement connected with this proposal, will be cheerfully defrayed without charge on the Missionary Fund." It was in consequence of this pledge that the Missionary Committee, after fully considering the case, acceded to the proposal of the Conference. And as to the Institution, it is to be remembered that it is only occasional attendance and inspection that will be required from the President. Mr. Entwisle resides on the premises, as the father of the family, as the special Pastor of the young men ; and the whole charge of their instruction is committed to Mr. Hannah, in conjunction with the Classical Tutor, who will reside among them. The Missionary department, therefore, will not lose, while the Institution will gain, by this arrangement. And, on the same subject, let it be distinctly understood that Mr. Bunting is no gainer. As Mission-Secretary, he receives the allowances of a Preacher in London : as President of the Institution he will receive nothing. In discharge of a public duty, he has consented to undertake a weighty and responsible task ; but with no possible reference to pecuniary advantage. Dr. Warren, however, wishes us to believe that by accepting the office, Mr. Bunting gains a great and very dangerous accession of power : " Almost the sole Dictatorship both of the Home and Foreign Department." There has been a time when I should have thought such an insinuation too absurd for notice ; but experience has shown me that passionate and prejudiced men are not prevented from receiving an insinuation by its absurdity. Sir, let any man look at the constitution of the Missionary Society ;

let him look at the names, for any year, of the Missionary Committee ; let him remember that the Senior Secretary is but one of three ; and then ask, how a man can become possessed of the Dictatorship of the Foreign Department," by virtue of his office as Secretary ? And so, too, of the Institution. What additional power, as to the Connexion, does Mr. Bunting gain, by his appointment to the Presidency ? Safely may his friends challenge those who are led away by such mischievous insinuations, to produce **PROOF** that he seeks the Dictatorship of either the Home or Foreign Department. To accuse of ambition, is one thing ; to give proof of the accusation, quite another.

And now that I am referring to Missionary affairs, I feel it right to advert to another subject of complaint, not, indeed, touched on in the pamphlet, but about which the Doctor's party, (among whom, let me unequivocally state, I do not include the brethren who voted at the Conference for the Doctor's amendment,) are making an outcry as loud as it is disgraceful. It has been customary for some years, (and very properly so,) to furnish some instruction to our young Missionaries, previously to their departure from England. For this object, which, for want of convenience and system, could be but very imperfectly secured, considerable sums have been expended. It is necessary,—and every year furnishes increasing proof that it is necessary,—that this should be done more efficiently and extensively ; and therefore that it should be done systematically. Young men, in the vast majority of instances, must have the proper instruction before they leave England ; or the full occupation of time and strength demanded by the arduous duties of a foreign station, will prevent their acquiring it at all. They have something else to do abroad than to pursue preparatory ministerial studies. Taking this case, therefore, into very serious consideration, the October and Provisional Committees agreed to recommend that *ten* of the *thirty* young men to be admitted into the Institution should be candidates for Missionary service. They likewise agreed to recommend, little dreaming that they should be accused of recommending a mal-appropriation of public money, that the expense thus incurred should be borne by the Mission-Fund ; that is, that the Missionary Treasurers should pay a sum to be agreed on by the two Committees, on the principle of just proportion. It would be known what was the expense of maintaining a student in the Institution ; and according to the number of Missionary candidates would be the sum to be paid from the Mission-Fund. And in this is there any thing unjust ? any thing unreasonable ? any thing to deserve the withdrawment of support from the great cause of Christian Missions ? Had there been only secret threats of such withdrawment, much as I should have felt, yet I should have made no public reference to so

dishonourable a fact. But what will the Christian public think,—what the friends of Christian Missions generally,—when they learn that at the present time, when Providence is presenting to the different Missionary Societies, and to our own among them, such unexampled openings for useful labour, especially in the West Indies; when the spirit of earnest desire for Christian instruction is so especially displayed among the savage tribes of Southern Africa, New Zealand, and the islands of the Pacific; when all is morning, and spring, and hope; at the time when the Committee, trusting to the holy enthusiasm in the cause of Christian Missions which seemed to be spreading through the length and breadth of the land, had been extending their operations to the utmost limits that prudence would allow;—that at that time, because the Wesleyan Committee of Management had agreed that one of their Secretaries should devote a portion of his time to the occasional inspection of an Institution for theological instruction, in which were a large proportion of their own Missionary candidates, and on the condition that that Institution should fully, and without expense to the Mission-Fund, supply his lack of service;—that because that Committee had agreed to pay for the more efficient instruction of these candidates, as they had paid for their less efficient instruction elsewhere;—that at such a time, and for such reasons, not only shall certain Christian Ministers refuse to continue their usual Missionary advocacy, but numerous individuals shall passionately resolve to withhold their contributions, on the faith of which heavy responsibilities had been incurred; shall, with loud and violent uproar, hinder the regular meetings from being held, and thus proclaim that they are resolved to do all in their power to destroy our whole Missionary establishment, in order to destroy an Institution whose formation had been hailed by other Christian denominations with truly fraternal kindness? Sir, God has thus permitted us to be humbled before the churches. Great was our glorying of our people; but many of them appear to be determined to make our glorying void. But why do I speak of Missionary Meetings? Can I expect *them* to be sacred, when the sanctity of God's day, of his house, of his worship, shall be rudely violated to gratify party spirit, and personal resentment? Short, I trust, will be this melancholy episode in the history of Wesleyan Methodism; and O that, when passed away, it could be erased from our annals, and utterly forgotten!

And now, Sir, in drawing to a close, I beg to observe that my object has been entirely defensive. From the beginning of this unhappy dispute, Dr. Warren has been the assailant. I have believed it to be my painful duty to repel his charges; and it has not been my fault that I could not do this but by such contradictions of his statements as amount to serious charges against himself. And

I must also observe that these implied charges cannot be disproved by denial. If Dr. Warren's friends come forward by scores to reply to what I have stated, their replies all amount to nothing. He has said that such and such occurrences took place, after a manner which he describes. I meet his statements by denial. There the case must rest till witnesses can be examined. If I have stated what is not true, I am amenable, in the first instance, to the brethren of the District in which I am stationed. I declare that I have unexceptionable witnesses of the truth of my allegations. Let me be put, Methodistically, on my defence. I shall not shrink from the trial.

I may add, too, that the friends of the newly-formed Institution have no reason to be alarmed. We are not intimidated by any of the proceedings and threats of Dr. Warren and his party. Nor have we reason to be ashamed of any part of our conduct. The edification of the Christian societies with which we are connected, and the more efficient exercise of the Christian ministry among them, not the gratification of personal ambition, are the objects we have had in view. Nor do we fear as to the result. We have well considered our cause, and are confident in its goodness. Such a cause can never be ultimately injured by attacks like those of Dr. Warren and his friends. Sooner or later it must and will prevail. The piety and good sense of the Wesleyan Methodists will triumph over prejudice and misapprehension; and the Wesleyan Theological Institution become one of the favourite objects of their liberal support.

I spoke of alarms and fears. Fears, I confess, the friends of the Institution may well entertain; but not for the safety of their cause. Their fears refer to very different subjects. The storm, even should it become more furious, will purify the atmosphere, and we shall have to rejoice in the bright and healthy serene that shall follow; but, in its passage, what devastations may it not occasion! In such times of contention many wander from the way of righteousness who never regain the path they have unhappily quitted. Often as bigotry may have made the term "schism" its watchword; yet is schism a real sin, and a sin that is never alone. Our fears are for the weak and the unstable, lest they should be permanently turned out of the way. As for the Institution, we humbly, but without any fear, commit all its interests to Him that judgeth righteously.

I cannot, Sir, lay aside the pen which I have most unwillingly taken up, without referring to Dr. Warren's bitter and reckless hostility against the Senior Secretary of our Missions. On this subject, Sir, I hope I may say, without boasting, that I think I am not altogether unqualified to write. Looking at the case as it is between the Doctor and Mr. Bunting, I see nothing to warp my judgment either way. I have no feelings of personal resentment to indulge, of personal friendship to gratify; and, whilst I act as a Christian Minister

should act, from neither the one nor the other have I any thing to fear. But I am not to withhold honour where honour is due, merely to prove my own independence. Such methods only prove the independence to be spurious; a mere compound of obstinacy and pride. I am satisfied that the time will come when full justice shall be done to the character and worth of a man who, could innocence have been borne down by calumny and falsehood, had been borne down long ago. God "shall bring forth his righteousness as the light, and his judgment as the noon-day." To no man, since the death of their venerable Founder, have the Wesleyan societies been more indebted. As for the charges of ambition and tyranny, they who truly know him, know how the case really stands, and pity the envious delusion in which such slanders originate. The liberties of the people, and the rights of the Preachers, are dearer and more sacred to no man than they are to himself, nor has any man done more to promote and secure them. The influence which he possesses arises, not from any office that he holds, but from the character he has so long sustained. Sir, I think I know the Methodist Preachers somewhat better than, I fear, Dr. Warren does; and, knowing them, I fearlessly assert, not only that Mr. Bunting's influence arises entirely from his acknowledged talent, and unimpeachable character, but that it could not have arisen otherwise. Knowing my brethren, as I believe I know them, I am persuaded that by no charges of Dr. Warren's will that influence be destroyed. While he retains his character, with such men he cannot lose his influence; and with such men,—and I am sure no man will acknowledge this more readily than himself,—let the character be forfeited, and the influence will go at once and for ever. Nor can I forget, while adverting to this subject, (in the present position of affairs by no means an unimportant one,) the consequences of what I believe to be the scriptural doctrine of the providential designation of individuals to certain positions of influence and usefulness. Supposing, Sir, an individual in any section of the Christian church to be endowed with peculiar aptitude for the regulation of its affairs; supposing him to be enabled, by the grace of God, to maintain the unimpeached integrity of the Christian character, and, in consequence of his acknowledged talents and character to obtain an influence as extensive as it is beneficial;—supposing such an individual, thus honoured of God and good men, to be made, for that reason, the object of envious hostility; to be assailed, not only by hireling scribblers, dealers in scandal by wholesale and retail, who seek to gain a livelihood by exciting the bad passions of human nature, but also by false brethren;—to his assailants we say nothing; we can only commend them to the mercy and compassion of God: To such an individual we would only say, "Go on, through evil and good

report, to fulfil your course, that you may finish it with joy:" But to those with whom such an individual was connected, we would say, "Take care that you provoke not the Lord to anger, by despising those whom he has raised up for your advantage; take care that you do not, by lending your sanction to unholy strife and contention, grieve the Good Spirit of God, and effectually impede the progress of true religion; but rather, 'do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom shine ye as lights in the world; holding forth the word of life; that we may rejoice in the day of Christ, that we have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.'"

Sir, among the original promoters of the Institution I was not numbered; but I esteem it an honour to have been, in a later stage of the proceedings, enrolled among them. Most heartily do I approve of the conduct of the nineteen truly honourable members of the October Committee, who, by persisting in their plans, have deserved so well of the Connexion. With them I am quite willing to stand or fall. In their various measures, as they were human, some marks of human infirmity may appear; but to the charges of "ARTIFICE," "WORLDLY POLICY," "DISHONOURABLE INTRIGUE," "SINISTER INTENTIONS," "DISINGENUOUS AND INTERESTED CONDUCT,"—charges which Dr. Warren has reiterated, and which imply that of *unprincipled conduct* in the very worst sense,—to these charges, from our very hearts, we plead, NOT GUILTY. Of one thing, Sir, I am perfectly satisfied, that to one of the parties in this unhappy contest, it must be said, "YE HAVE SINNED AGAINST THE LORD, AND BE SURE YOUR SIN WILL FIND YOU OUT."

I have now only to add, that I write this letter as an individual, and on my own individual responsibility. With the task of reply which I allotted myself, the Committee of the Institution have no connexion whatever, directly or indirectly. I wish this to be noticed the more particularly because to the Address of the Committee, stating the Objects and Principles of the Institution, the names of myself and my esteemed friend, Mr. Bowers, had to be appended as joint Secretaries. My letter possesses no official character whatever. I alone am responsible for its statements and publication.

I now beg to subscribe myself, with the respect due to your office and character,

Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE CUBITT.

EARL STREET, WESTMINSTER,
November 8th, 1834.

POSTSCRIPT.

IN a new edition of the Appendix to his pamphlet, Dr. Warren devotes half a page to my "Observations." Had he contented himself with "calling names," I should have taken no notice of what he has said. Hard words break no bones. But as he selects *one* of my statements for denial, and gives that as a specimen of the rest, I meet him on his own ground. Issue is now fairly joined. The Doctor's main charge against me is that of "*a culpable disregard of veracity.*" And certainly, as the case now stands, either I have wilfully stated a positive falsehood, or Dr. Warren has. I meet him on this ground, and leave the decision to any really IMPARTIAL judge. At the hazard of being again told of my "*lengthy reply,*" I will quote the whole of this part of the case, and thus give my readers a full opportunity of judging for themselves.

Dr. Warren says in his pamphlet, (as I have quoted, page 14,) "It was at this meeting that certain modifications of the plan, as left at the October Committee, were proposed for approbation. I STATED AT ONCE, that in consequence of what had occurred at the October Committee, and the subsequent correspondence, I was constrained to dissent in principle from the entire project."

On this I have remarked,

1. "I say, Sir, that he did not thus state his dissent *at once*. The real state of the case is this: So soon as the meeting was ready to proceed to business, Mr. Bunting asked whether Dr. Warren were still friendly to the principle of the Institution, or whether, since the October meetings, he had changed his opinions. Above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question," &c. (Page 14.)

2. "When the meeting had been opened, and the Minutes of the Provisional Committee confirmed in the usual way, that is, as being a true record of proceedings, Mr. Bunting asked whether the Doctor was, or whether he was not, friendly to the *principle* of a measure, modifications of which were about to be proposed. After several persons, as I have already stated, had endeavoured to elicit a reply, the one was given which I have mentioned before, 'In consequence of the *disingenuous* and *interested* conduct which has been practised, I have, certainly, changed my opinion.'" (Page 37.)

The reply now published by the Doctor is as follows:—

"THE REV. GEORGE CUBITT, next to the *veracious* Jonathan Crowther, has done me the honour of the most lengthy reply. The principal difference of character in these adventurous performers is, that the former, through inferior scholarship and coarser manners, possesses still less ability than the latter, to conceal the deep mortification felt by him and his party, at the

exposure of their sinister designs, under the *pretext* of a better mode of training our junior preachers, to construct an engine for more successfully strengthening a dominant episcopal faction! In one thing they most perfectly coincide—a *culpable disregard of veracity*!—Take one instance: At page 9, third Edition, of the ‘REMARKS,’ I have said, that ‘I at once stated my dissent from the entire project.’ Against this the Rev. George Cubitt has the hardihood to say, ‘that above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question,’ i. e. Whether I approved of the modified plan of the Institution.—To which I did *instantly* give what I intended to be, an unequivocal denial; and upon being told that I had not answered satisfactorily, I *immediately* replied, ‘That nothing was further from my intention than to disguise my sentiments,’ and subjoined these words, ‘*That I dissented in principle from the entire project.*’ So far from *truth* is the Rev. George Cubitt’s statement,—‘That I evaded the question for an hour,’ that I challenge every one, who was attentive to what passed, to bear witness, in *His* presence, where no falsehood can escape detection, that I did not *for one moment* evade the most explicit answer which I could put into words!—Other statements, equally remote from truth, disgrace almost every page of the REV. GEORGE CUBITT’S vulgar and impudent Pamphlet! The one I have given is a sufficient specimen.”

And now for my own reply. Whether true or false, it shall be unequivocal.

1. As to *inferior scholarship, coarser manners, vulgarity, and impudence*, I am quite content to let them go for as much as they are worth. But what have they to do with the questions really at issue?

2. The Doctor is again practising, what I now ADVISEDLY call, his UNPRINCIPLED plan of keeping back essential parts of the truth. I tell him, and I tell all who are canting and whining about the ill-usage he has met with, that, in his actual reply to the long-evaded question, he embodied a serious charge against the *moral principles* of his coadjutors on the October Committee, by asserting their conduct to have been *disingenuous and interested*. Whatever be the issue of the contest, war was proclaimed, and the first blow struck, by Dr. Warren. Even *had* his own motives been attacked, (and they were not,) he has no right to complain of what would only have been a *retort* of his own previous charge.

3. The Doctor, in the most explicit manner, brings against “me and my party,” a charge of *the very basest hypocrisy*. He says that he has exposed our “*sinister designs*,” which he says are these: “*Under PRETEXT of a better mode of training our junior Preachers, to CONSTRUCT AN ENGINE for more successfully strengthening a dominant episcopal faction.*” I thank him for this openness. He charges us not with mistake, but with the vilest hypocrisy possible. To such a charge as this an indignant reply

must really be allowed. It could only have been made by a man fully capable of such conduct himself. I most unequivocally, and in the strongest terms in which denial can be expressed, deny being guilty of a line of conduct, in abhorrence of which I will yield neither to the Doctor nor any of his adherents, however loud their professions.

4. Any impartial reader will *now* see, what the original statement of the Doctor was intended to conceal, that his *explicit reply* was not given *at once*. The original statement was simply, "Certain modifications were proposed, and I *at once* stated." It now appears, on the Doctor's own admission, that questions were asked, that his reply was not considered satisfactory, and that something had been said about "disguising sentiments." All this is to be collected from the Doctor's reply; yet at first, all this was concealed, I now say *intentionally* concealed, under, "The modifications were proposed; and I at once stated," &c.

5. I now charge Dr. Warren with publishing A DIRECT FALSEHOOD in his present reply. I beg particular attention to this, as it will illustrate the character of *his* regard for veracity. I have said in the paragraphs now before the reader, that Dr. Warren evaded, for above an hour, a direct reply to a certain question. This he unequivocally denies. I will consider his denial by and bye; but at present, I ask this plain question, What was that inquiry to which I, in my pamphlet, in the very place quoted by the Doctor, and therefore open before him, say that he evaded a reply? Let the reader turn to it, (I have given it above,) and he will see the Doctor's quotation to be contained in the paragraph, and immediately following the question itself. "Mr. Bunting asked whether Dr. Warren were still friendly to *the principle* of the Institution, or whether, since the October meetings, he had changed his opinions." This is the question which I say he evaded; and he has now "the hardihood" (I thank him for that word, and thus throw it back to him) to put the case thus: "The Rev. George Cubitt has the hardihood to say that 'above an hour elapsed before the Doctor could be brought to give an unevasive reply to this plain question,' i. e., *whether I approved of the modified plan of the Institution.*" Whether he evaded or not, *this* is not the question which I *say* he evaded; and, with that question before him, he puts down another, altogether different; and then publishes to the world that I charge him with having evaded a question about which I said nothing at all. This is not only falsehood, but gross, glaring falsehood. Dr. Warren says that I charge him with evading *one* question, knowing, at the same time, (having it before him,) that I charged him with evading *another* and *a very different one*.

6. As I am explicitly charged with *a culpable disregard of vera-*

city in my pamphlet, I demand to be put on my trial before my proper District Meeting. That will bring the matter to a point, and show where this *culpable disregard of veracity* is really to be found.

7. And now, having disposed of these subordinate matters, I come to his explicit denial of my statement. We are now,—on one single point, selected by himself, as a specimen of my pamphlet, and thus put forth as decisive of the case,—we are now at issue. I like this. There is no bush-fighting here. I say one thing; the Doctor meets me by direct denial. I have accepted his challenge. Although pressed for time, and labouring under indisposition from a fall which might have been fatal, in direct violation of the injunctions of my medical attendant and friend, I have gone to different persons who were present at the meeting, and procured an attestation of the correctness of my statements, which, I hope, will settle the question as to *this* part of it. When Dr. Warren comes forward with a contradiction, as to any other statement which I have made, I will endeavour to meet him as fairly as I have met him now.

“WE, the undersigned, were present at the Committee-meeting of the 17th of July, to which Mr. Cubitt refers in the paragraphs of his pamphlet above quoted, and thus vouch their correctness.”

LANCELOT HASLOPE

THEOPHILUS LESSEY

JAMES HUNTER

WILLIAM NAYLOR

JAMES HOBY

DANIEL WALTON

WILLIAM POCOCK

THOMAS JACKSON

JOSEPH CUSWORTH

JOHN BEECHAM

ALEXANDER BELL

ELIJAH HOOLE.

WESTMINSTER,
November 27th, 1831.

THE END.

special
collec.

BW401
.C802
1834